1	STATE OF MINNESOTA DISTRICT COURT
2	COUNTY OF RAMSEY SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT
3	
4	The State of Minnesota,
5	by Hubert H. Humphrey, III,
6	its attorney general,
7	and
8	Blue Cross and Blue Shield
9	of Minnesota,
10	Plaintiffs,
11	vs. File No. C1-94-8565
12	Philip Morris Incorporated, R.J.
13	Reynolds Tobacco Company, Brown &
14	Williamson Tobacco Corporation,
15	B.A.T. Industries P.L.C., Lorillard
16	Tobacco Company, The American
17	Tobacco Company, Liggett Group, Inc.,
18	The Council for Tobacco Research-U.S.A.,
19	Inc., and The Tobacco Institute, Inc.,
20	Defendants.
21	
22	
23	DEPOSITION OF DAVID WILSON
24	Volume II, Pages 255 - 496
25	

1	(The following is the continued deposition
2	of DAVID WILSON, taken pursuant to Notice of Taking
3	Deposition by Rule 30.02(f), by videotape, at the
4	offices of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, Attorneys at
5	Law, 425 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York, on
6	August 15, 1997, commencing at approximately 8:31
7	o'clock a.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	APPEARANCES:
13	On Behalf of the Plaintiffs:
14	Martha K. Wivell
15	Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi
16	2800 LaSalle Plaza
17	800 LaSalle Avenue
18	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2015
19	
20	On Behalf of Lorillard Tobacco Company:
21	David S. Miller
22	Doherty, Rumble & Butler
23	2800 Minnesota World Trade Center
24	30 East Seventh Street
25	St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-4999

1	On Behalf of Philip Morris Incorporated:
2	Daniel J. Ballintine
3	Dorsey & Whitney LLP
4	Pillsbury Center South
5	220 South Sixth Street
6	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-1498
7	
8	On Behalf of B.A.T. Industries P.L.C.:
9	Mary Elizabeth McGarry and Kevin D. Lewis
10	Simpson Thacher & Bartlett
11	425 Lexington Avenue
12	New York, New York 10017-3954
13	
14	ALSO PRESENT:
15	Martyn Gilbey
16	British-American Tobacco Company Limited
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1			I N D E X	
2	EXHIBIT	S	DESCRIPTION	PAGE MARKED
3	Wilson	630	31st January 1984 note,	
4			Bruell to Sheehy, Bates	
5			201766407-9	270
б		631	1st April 1985 letter,	
7			Sheehy to Thornton, Bates	
8			107319203	273
9		632	27th March 1985 note,	
10			Thornton to Sheehy, Bates	
11			107319207	274
12		633	Draft 3.4.85 Tobacco	
13			Research in BAT Industries,	
14			Bates 100593450-8	284
15		634	10th November 1989 Tobacco	
16			Strategy Review Team minute	S,
17			Bates 201831067-73	290
18		635	Meeting 4th-5th January	
19			1988, JFK Hilton, New York,	
20			Bates 650900469-74	297
21		636	8 September 1995	
22			correspondence, Barton to	
23			Brookes, Bates 482100366-77	304
24		637	19 May 1981 letter, Blackma	n
25			to Sanford, Bates 109841684	322

1	638	15th August 1984 letter,	
2		Ricketts to Bruell, Bates	
3		109870737	328
4	639	Presentation to B.A.T	
5		Industries p.l.c. Board	
6		Members, July 25, 1994,	
7		Bates 500022558	333
8	640	April 12, 1985 letter, Alar	
9		to Dennis, Bates 674107764-83	355
10	641	August 8, 1979 memorandum,	
11		McKeown to Willets and Reid,	
12		Bates 660067096-7	365
13	642	May 31, 1991 internal	
14		correspondence, Honeycutt to	
15		Raymond, Bates 583223073-6	372
16	643	Smoking and Health, Sheehy	
17		to list, Bates 202213866-72	377
18	644	17th August 1983 CAC VIII,	
19		Bruell to Thornton, Bates	
20		107318466-7	386
21	645	Supplemental Affidavit of	
22		David Wilson, 4 pages	414
23			
24			
25			

1	646	1987 BATUKE Work Programme:	
2		Project Areas Attributed to	
3		BAT Industries, Bates	
4		109068035-7	420
5	647	2nd October 1991 Minutes of	
6		Meeting, Bates 500038508-9	427
7	648	28th July 1992 B.A.T	
8		Industries' Guidelines,	
9		Sheehy to Pritchard, Bates	
10		201761526-7	434
11	649	5 August 1994 letter, Herter	
12		to Sandefur, Bates	
13		191002374-7	440
14	650	Brown & Williamson Preview	
15		1992-1996, Bates 201787454-5	455
16	651	14th March 1994 letter,	
17		Chamberlayne to Sandefur,	
18		Bates 191001064-74	466
19	652	27th June 1994 B.A.T	
20		Industries PLC Reporting	
21		Minutes, Bates 201065580	468
22	653	12th/13th June 1984 Visit to	
23		BAT Hamburg, Biotechnology	
24		Project, Bates 109873283-6	483
25			

1	2908	August 7, 1997 letter, Wivell	
2		to Svoboda, 9 pages	479
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	WITNESS	EXAMINATION BY	PAGE
9	David Wilson	Ms. Wivell	262
10		Ms. McGarry	480
11		Ms. Wivell	481
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

- 1 PROCEEDINGS
 2 (Witness previously sworn.)
 3 DAVID WILSON
 4 called as a witness, being previously
 5 sworn, was examined and testified
 6 as follows:
 7 ADVERSE EXAMINATION (cont'd)
 8 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 9 Q. All right. Good morning, sir. You understand
- 10 you're still under oath; right?
- 11 A. I do, yes.
- 12 Q. All right. Yesterday I had asked you to see if
- 13 you could find out the answers to some questions I
- 14 had asked that you didn't know, and I would like to
- 15 start this morning by finding out whether you have
- 16 found out the answer to any of those questions.
- 17 A. Inquiries have been made overnight and we
- 18 haven't got the answers yet, but we may have some
- 19 answers for you in the course of this morning.
- 20 Q. All right. So you --
- 21 So you don't have any additional information to
- 22 any of the questions that I asked yesterday that you
- 23 weren't able to -- to answer?
- 24 A. Not at this particular time.
- 25 Q. All right.

- 1 MS. McGARRY: I think the only information
- 2 we have is you had asked what Carl Schoenbachler
- 3 meant when he used a certain phrase in a document
- 4 he'd written, and we have ascertained that
- 5 Mr. Schoenbachler has never worked for B.A.T.
- 6 Industries; he's a B&W employee. And you also asked
- 7 some questions about the CAC, and the person most
- 8 knowledgable about that would be Martin Broughton,
- 9 who you've already deposed, and in fact you asked the
- 10 very question you wanted Mr. Wilson to get the answer
- 11 to to Martin Broughton.
- MS. WIVELL: I also yesterday asked for a
- 13 copy of affidavits that Mr. Wilson had filed in the
- 14 Pennsylvania case, and I was told there were none. I
- 15 have since reread the Arch decision filed in the
- 16 United States District Court for the Eastern District
- 17 of Pennsylvania, and it refers to not one, but two
- 18 affidavits from Mr. Wilson, one apparently filed in
- 19 opposition and then one filed in rebuttal, and I
- 20 again ask for those affidavits. I asked to be
- 21 provided a copy of them before the deposition began
- 22 today, and my request was met with silence. I would
- 23 like to have a copy of those affidavits.
- MS. McGARRY: I think you misunderstood
- 25 me. What I said yesterday, certainly Mr. Wilson has

- 1 filed an affidavit and a rebuttal affidavit in the
- 2 Arch case, where the judge granted B.A.T. Industries'
- 3 jurisdiction motion. What I said was that neither of
- 4 those affidavits addressed the TSRT.
- 5 Yesterday you had represented to Mr. Wilson that
- 6 he had filed an affidavit in that case addressing the
- 7 R -- TSRT. I think you've misread the Arch opinion.
- 8 The affidavit evidence in that case relating to the
- 9 TSRT was given by Professor Stobaugh, an expert who
- 10 plaintiffs will be deposing in this case.
- MS. WIVELL: Well I don't believe --
- MS. McGARRY: Excuse me, I wasn't
- 13 finished.
- MS. WIVELL: Oh, I'm sorry. You stopped so
- 15 I assumed you had finished.
- MS. McGARRY: I don't see either of the
- 17 Arch affidavits on the predesignation list and I
- 18 don't think you'll be using them to impeach
- 19 Mr. Wilson and I don't think we're required to do
- 20 your work product for the plaintiffs, do your
- 21 research and get documents for you to use, so I will
- 22 provide those to you after the deposition today, but
- 23 not before the deposition concludes.
- MS. WIVELL: All right. Well first of all,
- 25 I did not ask specifically about TSRT with regard to

- 1 those affidavits. That's number one. You're
- 2 mischaracterizing what happened yesterday.
- 3 Number two, Wilson affidavits are on the
- 4 supplemental, if not the original, predesignation
- 5 list, and I would appreciate receiving them so that I
- 6 can ask him questions about them, especially since
- 7 they concern subjects relating to the subject matter
- 8 of this deposition, and I had asked for them
- 9 yesterday and was told that there were none.
- 10 MS. McGARRY: We've never received a
- 11 supplemental designation list --
- MS. WIVELL: You were --
- MS. McGARRY: -- for David Wilson.
- MS. WIVELL: Oh, I'm sorry, not for David
- 15 Wilson. Then it was on the original one. It's right
- 16 at the top of the list.
- MS. McGARRY: Yeah, it says "Affidavit of"
- 18 David "Wilson."
- 19 MS. WIVELL: Uh-huh, that's right. It
- 20 doesn't say which affidavit, does it, ma'am?
- MS. McGARRY: No, it doesn't identify the
- 22 case. I assumed you were talking about in this
- 23 case. We will not be providing you with these scores
- 24 of affidavits Mr. Wilson has filed in other cases.
- MS. WIVELL: Oh, I'm not asking for the

- 1 scores of affidavits. I'm asking for the affidavits
- 2 I was told yesterday didn't exist.
- 3 MS. McGARRY: If you misunderstood me, I --
- 4 MS. WIVELL: No, ma'am, I didn't
- 5 misunderstand you. I knew exactly what I was talking
- 6 about and checked it and found out that you did
- 7 indeed misrepresent to me on the record yesterday
- 8 that whether he had filed an affidavit in
- 9 Pennsylvania.
- MS. McGARRY: Are you done?
- MS. WIVELL: Oh, yeah, I'm done.
- MS. McGARRY: I'm sorry if you
- 13 misunderstood. I meant to convey to you that we
- 14 couldn't find any reference in those affidavits to
- 15 the TSRT, which is what you represented to
- 16 Mr. Wilson, he had sworn an affidavit concerning the
- 17 TSRT, and then proceeded to ask him who he talked to
- 18 to get the information he put in his affidavit.
- Just to be absolutely clear, there are two
- 20 Wilson affidavits in the Arch action in
- 21 Pennsylvania. Neither of them refers to the TSRT.
- 22 MS. WIVELL: All right. But they do refer
- 23 to jurisdiction matters, and that's what I was asking
- 24 about yesterday and will continue to ask about today,
- 25 but just so the record is clear, you have refused to

- 1 provide them to me, so we'll move on.
- 2 MS. McGARRY: I've refused to provide
- 3 you -- to you for use at this deposition at this
- 4 time. I said I would give them to you later, but
- 5 they aren't -- we weren't given adequate notice you
- 6 intended to use them and you're not being -- going to
- 7 be using them for impeachment.
- 8 MS. WIVELL: Well they're -- affidavits for
- 9 Mr. Wilson are listed on the list.
- 10 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 11 Q. Now, sir, we were talking at the end of the day
- 12 yesterday about the compendium of epidemiology. Do
- 13 you recall that, sir?
- 14 A. I recall our discussion, yes.
- 15 Q. All right. And Mr. Thornton was involved in
- 16 that compendium, wasn't he, sir?
- 17 A. The note of the meeting between Sir Patrick
- 18 Sheehy, Mr. Bruell and Mr. Thornton would suggest
- 19 that Mr. Thornton was involved in that compendium.
- 20 Q. Well, sir, you know for a fact that Mr. Thornton
- 21 was involved, weren't you, sir?
- 22 A. I know --
- MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 24 A. I know only from the documents that I saw.
- 25 Q. You know, sir, that Mr. Thornton kept Mr. Sheehy

- 1 apprised of matters relating to the epidemiological
- 2 compendium; correct?
- 3 MS. McGARRY: Can you lower your voice,
- 4 Ms. Wivell.
- 5 MS. WIVELL: I'm sorry, I'm not speaking
- 6 loudly, ma'am.
- 7 MS. McGARRY: Oh, it seems that way to me.
- 8 You may be angry at me, but that's no reason --
- 9 MS. WIVELL: Oh, I'm not angry at anyone --
- 10 MS. McGARRY: -- to be nasty to Mr. Wilson.
- 11 MS. WIVELL: -- and I'm not being nasty to
- 12 anyone. And I think the --
- MS. McGARRY: Please don't interrupt me,
- 14 Ms. Wivell.
- 15 MS. WIVELL: -- I think the record will
- 16 reflect I'm not yelling, raising my voice or anything
- 17 like that. I'm asking questions, and I'd prefer to
- 18 get on with it, ma'am. If you have trouble, then
- 19 make an objection.
- 20 MS. McGARRY: I find your voice
- 21 unnecessarily loud and I'm asking you to lower it.
- MS. WIVELL: Well perhaps it's because I
- 23 have a hearing problem and sometimes I don't know how
- 24 loud I'm speaking, but I'm --
- MS. McGARRY: That's why I'm advising you.

- 1 MS. WIVELL: -- speaking in a normal tone
- 2 of voice for me.
- 3 MS. McGARRY: Well your normal tone of
- 4 voice --
- 5 MS. WIVELL: Well the record will
- 6 reflect --
- 7 MS. McGARRY: -- I think is unnecessarily
- 8 loud.
- 9 MS. WIVELL: -- that, I think. The
- 10 videotape will be perfectly fine and it will show
- 11 I'm -- that all you're doing is creating controversy
- 12 when none exists.
- MS. McGARRY: Can we agree not to interrupt
- 14 each other for the rest of the deposition,
- 15 Ms. Wivell?
- MS. WIVELL: Well if you'll do it, I'm --
- 17 I'm happy.
- 18 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 19 Q. Sir, let me go back to my question since I was
- 20 interrupted in asking it.
- 21 You know that Mr. Thornton kept Mr. Sheehy
- 22 apprised of matters relating to the epidem --
- 23 epidemiology compendium; correct?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, asked and
- 25 answered. Go ahead.

- 1 A. From the document which you presented to me
- 2 yesterday as an exhibit, it was clear that
- 3 Mr. Thornton kept Patrick Sheehy apprised of
- 4 developments concerning the compendium.
- 5 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 630 was marked
- for identification.)
- 7 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 8 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 9 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 630, this is a document from
- 10 B.A.T. Industries Bates numbered 201766407; correct?
- 11 A. The document bears the Bates number you have
- 12 given. I do not know whether it is a document from
- 13 B.A.T. Industries.
- 14 Q. It says so at the bottom of the page, "BAT
- 15 INDUSTRIES MINNESOTA TOBACCO LITIGATION, " doesn't
- 16 it?
- 17 A. It says -- yes, it says "BAT INDUSTRIES -
- 18 MINNESOTA TOBACCO LITIGATION."
- 19 Q. All right. And there is a note to Patrick
- 20 Sheehy on the first page from E. A. A. Bruell;
- 21 right?
- 22 A. Yes, there is.
- 23 Q. And it notes that he was asked to be kept
- 24 informed of -- of how the Compendium of
- 25 Epidemiological Studies was progressing; right?

- 1 MS. McGARRY: Objection, ambiguous.
- 2 A. Could you repeat the question, please.
- 3 Q. Certainly. And the memo from Mr. Bruell to
- 4 Mr. Sheehy notes that Sheehy had asked to be kept
- 5 informed of how the Compendium of Epidemiological
- 6 Studies was progressing; right?
- 7 A. That's what the first sentence says.
- 8 Q. All right. And, sir, attached is a report from
- 9 Mr. Thornton on the compendium; correct?
- 10 A. That's what the second sentence of the note to
- 11 Mr. Sheehy says, yes.
- 12 Q. And the note is or --
- 13 The report is attached, isn't it, sir?
- 14 A. There is a progress report dated January 1984
- 15 headed "COMPENDIUM OF OF EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES."
- 16 Q. And, sir, isn't it a fact that the chairman of
- 17 B.A.T. Industries asked that copies of the compendium
- 18 be sent to various individuals?
- 19 MS. McGARRY: I'd just like to note for the
- 20 record that the attachment to the first page of
- 21 Exhibit 630 was not predesignated and is improperly
- 22 being used since it's not used for impeachment.
- 23 A. Sorry, could you read the question back to me,
- 24 please.
- 25 Q. Yes, sir, but first I want to respond to that.

- 1 MS. WIVELL: I believe that the attachment
- 2 was predesignated.
- 3 MS. McGARRY: Well here's the list,
- 4 Martha.
- 5 MS. WIVELL: Fine. Look for it under a
- 6 separate number. Let me repeat the question.
- 7 MS. McGARRY: While we're at it, your
- 8 predesignation says "Affidavit," singular, "of" David
- 9 "Wilson," not "affidavits," plural. I think we'll
- 10 mark that as an exhibit. You may proceed.
- MS. WIVELL: Well thank you, Counsel.
- 12 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 13 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that the chairman of B.A.T.
- 14 Industries asked that copies of the compendium be
- 15 sent to different individuals?
- 16 A. Yesterday you showed me a -- a document which
- 17 was a note of a meeting between Sir Patrick Sheehy or
- 18 Mr. Sheehy, as I think he then was, Mr. Bruell and
- 19 Mr. Thornton in which various discussions -- minutes
- 20 were made of that meeting at which it was noted that
- 21 the com -- the draft of the compendium would be
- 22 circulated to various people for comment or for
- 23 review, including external specialists.
- 24 Q. And, sir, there's a handwritten note on the
- 25 bottom of the first page of Exhibit 630 that "EAAB

- 1 will circulate note to all CAC participants bringing
- 2 them up to date"; correct?
- 3 A. That's what the handwritten note appears to say,
- 4 yes.
- 5 Q. And in fact, the Compendium of Epidemiological
- 6 Studies was circulated to representatives of the
- 7 various CAC companies; correct?
- 8 A. I do not know whether --
- 9 MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 10 A. I do not know whether that is the case.
- 11 Q. The second page of the document in the second
- 12 paragraph -- no, strike that.
- 13 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 631 was marked
- for identification.)
- 15 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 16 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 17 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 631, this is a document Bates
- 18 numbered 107319203; correct?
- 19 A. Yes, correct.
- 20 Q. And it's a memo from Patrick Sheehy to
- 21 Dr. Thornton; correct?
- 22 A. Yes. That appears to be the case, yes.
- 23 Q. And in this memorandum, Mr. Sheehy directs that
- 24 the compendium be sent to a Professor Burch;
- 25 correct?

- 1 A. I --
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, mischaracterizes
- 3 the document. You may answer.
- 4 A. You've made the very point I would have made.
- 5 It does mischaracterize the document. The
- 6 document -- what Mr. Sheehy is saying in the document
- 7 is that he considers it would be useful if a copy of
- 8 the second draft of the compendium was sent to
- 9 Professor Burch.
- 10 Q. And that --
- 11 A. It doesn't direct anybody to send a -- the draft
- 12 to Professor Burch, not in this document at any
- 13 rate.
- 14 Q. And it was -- I'm sorry.
- The compendium was sent to Dr. Burch at
- 16 Mr. Sheehy's request, wasn't it, sir?
- 17 A. I have no knowledge of that.
- 18 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 632 was marked
- for identification.)
- 20 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 21 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 22 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 632, this is a memo to Mr. Sheehy
- 23 regarding the Compendium of Epidemiological Studies;
- 24 correct?
- 25 A. Subject -- yes, it refers to the Compendium of

- 1 Epidemiological Studies. It's the heading of the --
- 2 of the note.
- 3 Q. And it --
- 4 This document is Bates numbered 107319207;
- 5 right?
- 6 A. That's correct.
- 7 Q. All right. And it again discusses sending
- 8 Dr. Burch a copy of the compendium?
- 9 MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 10 Q. Right?
- 11 A. It refers to a proposal to send a copy of the
- 12 second draft of the compendium to Professor Burch
- 13 with a view to getting an informal opinion from him.
- 14 Q. And as you sit here today, you can't tell us
- 15 whether or not that document was sent to Professor
- 16 Burch?
- 17 A. I cannot.
- 18 Q. You understand that Professor Burch was in the
- 19 United States, sir; correct?
- 20 A. At the time that this note was written to
- 21 Mr. Sheehy by Mr. Thornton from British-American
- 22 Tobacco Company, BATCO, it appears that Professor
- 23 Burch was then absent, in the United States.
- 24 Q. Now the Compendium of Epidemiological Studies
- 25 was completed and circulated to CAC countries;

- 1 right?
- 2 MS. McGARRY: Objection, CAC companies.
- 3 And that question's been asked and answered and
- 4 Mr. Wilson told you yesterday he didn't have an
- 5 answer and he would try to get it, and he told you
- 6 this morning that he doesn't have the answer yet and
- 7 he told you when you asked him the question again
- 8 this morning he doesn't know. So we're still
- 9 endeavoring to get the information for you.
- 10 A. I'm not in a position to say what at the moment
- 11 the CAC companies were. I'm not sure at what
- 12 particular time you're referring to, and I simply
- 13 have no information to confirm or deny what you've
- 14 said.
- MS. WIVELL: Mr. LaBorde, could you get out
- 16 Exhibit 531.
- 17 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 531 was handed
- to the witness.)
- 19 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 20 Q. Sir, showing you what's been previously marked
- 21 as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 531, this is a document that
- 22 bears the Bates number 304019530 as its beginning
- 23 Bates number; correct?
- 24 A. Correct.
- 25 Q. Would you turn to the page that ends with Bates

- 1 number 554.
- 2 MS. McGARRY: Excuse me. Do you have
- 3 another copy of it?
- 4 MS. WIVELL: No, I don't.
- 5 Q. I'm sorry. It's 534, sir. It's actually the
- 6 fifth page of the document.
- 7 MS. McGARRY: I'm going to have to look on
- 8 with you, David, if you don't mind.
- 9 THE WITNESS: Yeah, that's fine.
- 10 A. The pages aren't clearly numbered with the Bates
- 11 number, so perhaps you could just identify the page.
- 12 Q. All right. Do you see --
- Do you have the page that starts at the top
- 14 "Note for the Tobacco Strategy Review Team Meeting,
- 15 Progress report on Smoking Issues"?
- 16 A. Yes, I do.
- 17 Q. And there it talks about the publication/use of
- 18 the compendium; right?
- 19 A. It does, and if you're going to ask me questions
- 20 on this, I'd like to read the -- the document,
- 21 please.
- 22 Q. All right. I suggest -- I'm only going to be
- 23 asking you questions at this point about this page,
- 24 so if you could just read the page, I'd appreciate
- 25 it.

- 1 MS. McGARRY: Well if you need to read any
- 2 more, you can do that.
- 3 MS. WIVELL: Well that's fine.
- 4 MS. McGARRY: I'm sure we all know that
- 5 individual things can be taken out of context.
- 6 MS. WIVELL: Well I understand, but this
- 7 document is probably, oh, 40 or 50 pages, so I would
- 8 hope that he wouldn't need to read the whole thing.
- 9 MS. McGARRY: When you're done, I'll need a
- 10 moment to look at it as well.
- 11 (Witness reviews Plaintiffs' Exhibit 531.)
- MS. McGARRY: Excuse me.
- 13 (Ms. McGarry reviews Plaintiffs'
- 14 Exhibit 531.)
- MS. McGARRY: Okay.
- 16 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 17 Q. Sir, you've now had the opportunity to read the
- 18 page that concerns publication/use of the compendium;
- 19 right?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Now according to this document, there were four
- 22 different works that had been presented to the
- 23 Tobacco Strategy Review Team; right?
- 24 A. Sorry, I -- can you repeat the question again?
- 25 Q. All right. Well let me rephrase it.

- 1 The Compendium of Epidemiological Studies had
- 2 been completed at the time this document was written;
- 3 right?
- 4 A. I think that's a fair characterization from what
- 5 the document says, yes.
- 6 Q. And the compendium was presented to the Tobacco
- 7 Strategy Review Team?
- 8 A. It's not clear to me from this particular
- 9 document that that was the case. What the document
- 10 says is the -- this document has been circulated to
- 11 CAC companies and Wills Australia only.
- 12 Q. All right. And in addition to the compendium,
- 13 three other documents had been completed; correct?
- 14 A. That, I think, is a fair characterization again
- 15 from what the words say here.
- 16 Q. All right. And it was reported to the Tobacco
- 17 Strategy Review Team that a document entitled
- 18 "Smoking and Health: the Unresolved Debate" had been
- 19 completed and circulated to the CAC and BATCO
- 20 companies?
- 21 A. It actually says that the document you've
- 22 described has been circulated both to CAC and BATCO
- 23 companies and goes on to say that it is also -- it is
- 24 to be used both internally and externally and refers
- 25 in fact to external persons who may receive the

- 1 document, which includes, and I quote, "government
- 2 ministers, regulatory authorities or scientific and
- 3 medical professionals known to the company, " close
- 4 quote.
- 5 Q. And do you understand that the booklet entitled
- 6 "Smoking and Health: the Unresolved Debate" was
- 7 provided to sources outside of the B.A.T. Group
- 8 companies?
- 9 A. I have no specific knowledge as to whether it
- 10 was or -- or wasn't. I assume from this document
- 11 that it in fact was.
- 12 Q. Now, sir, another document that had been
- 13 developed was entitled "Environmental Tobacco Smoke:
- 14 the Science"; right?
- 15 A. The -- the document says that such a document
- 16 has been circulated to CAC and BATCO companies.
- 17 Q. And the document the "Environmental Tobacco
- 18 Smoke: the Science" was circulated to those
- 19 companies, wasn't it, sir?
- 20 A. I do not know whether it was or was not.
- 21 Q. It was redone under the title "Smoking and
- 22 Health: the Unresolved Debate" to be used outside of
- 23 BATCO -- or outside of the B.A.T. Group companies;
- 24 right?
- 25 A. I'm sorry, I don't understand that --

- 1 Q. All right.
- 2 A. -- that question.
- 3 Q. Well the page -- the paragraph concerning the
- 4 document entitled, quote, "Environmental Tobacco
- 5 Smoke: the Science, " close quote, had been made
- 6 available for external use under the title "Smoking
- 7 and Health: the Unresolved Debate"; right?
- 8 A. Yeah, the -- the paragraph says "It is
- 9 available" -- and I believe that to be a reference to
- 10 "Environmental Tobacco Smoke: the Science." "It is
- 11 available for much wider internal and external use
- 12 than, " quote, "'Smoking and Health: the Unresolved
- 13 Debate, '" close quotes.
- 14 Q. The fourth document that had been developed was
- 15 entitled "Environmental Tobacco Smoke: Improving the
- 16 Quality of Public Debate"; right?
- 17 A. Could you just read back that question to me,
- 18 please.
- 19 Q. Certainly. The fourth document that had been
- 20 developed was entitled, quote, "Environmental Tobacco
- 21 Smoke: Improving the Quality" -- I'm sorry, I've lost
- 22 it. Let me rephrase the question.
- The fourth document that was developed was
- 24 entitled, quote, "Environmental Tobacco Smoke:
- 25 Improving the Quality of Public Debate"; correct?

- 1 A. It seems from this document that that document
- 2 that you've just described was developed.
- 3 Q. And in fact, a group of firm lawyers,
- 4 Covington & Burling, had produced a version of the
- 5 document for use outside of the B.A.T. Group
- 6 company?
- 7 A. Well can we just be a bit clear here, please,
- 8 about what we mean by "B.A.T. Group." It says
- 9 "non-BAT companies," and I don't know whether this
- 10 is a reference to companies outside the B.A.T.
- 11 Industries Group or whether this is talking about
- 12 whether this is a reference to British-American
- 13 Tobacco. I don't know what the -- the reference
- 14 means, but what the words say is "A US firm of
- 15 lawyers, Covington and Burling, have also produced a
- 16 version of the document for wider industry use by
- 17 non-BAT companies that will hopefully be circulated
- 18 with the help of Infotab."
- 19 Q. Now what was INFOTAB?
- 20 A. I do not know.
- 21 Q. Sir, you would agree that BATCO was charged by
- 22 B.A.T. Industries to work on R&D objectives. Pardon
- 23 me. Isn't that true?
- 24 A. Let's see if I can help you on this. I think
- 25 the -- the -- the situation regarding B.A.T.

- 1 Industries is -- is this: B.A.T. Industries, as I've
- 2 mentioned I think on numerous occasions, is an
- 3 investment company. It holds interests in other
- 4 companies who conduct various businesses. B.A.T.
- 5 Industries itself doesn't carry on any tobacco
- 6 business. It doesn't employ scientists. There is no
- 7 one on the staff that carries out research and
- 8 development. There is no reason why anyone on the
- 9 staff should carry out research and development
- 10 because B.A.T. Industries doesn't make or market
- 11 cigarette products.
- 12 Accordingly, it would be natural, it would be a
- 13 quite logical conclusion to come to that research and
- 14 development activities to the extent that they were
- 15 being carried on in the group were being carried on
- 16 by companies who were in the business -- in the
- 17 tobacco business. British-American Tobacco Company,
- 18 BATCO, is an obvious example of that.
- 19 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive. My question
- 20 was a little bit different than your answer, sir.
- 21 Isn't it a fact that the B.A.T. Industries board
- 22 charged BATCO with -- or to work on R&D projects?
- MS. McGARRY: That's a different question,
- 24 and the previous answer was responsive. You may
- 25 answer this question.

- 1 A. B.A.T. Industries charged BATCO to carry out
- 2 research and development. The conduct of research
- 3 and development -- development by BATCO would be, I
- 4 would have thought, a necessary incident of its own
- 5 business. Certainly B.A.T. Industries would not have
- 6 charged BATCO to carry out research and development
- 7 on behalf of B.A.T. Industries. B.A.T. Industries is
- 8 not in the business of making and selling cigarettes,
- 9 and therefore it's not -- it's not a necessary
- 10 incident of its business that it should conduct
- 11 research and development.
- MS. WIVELL: Can we go off the record,
- 13 please.
- 14 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 15 (Recess taken.)
- 16 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 633 was marked
- 17 for identification.)
- 18 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 19 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 20 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 633, this is a document Bates
- 21 numbered 100593450; correct?
- 22 A. Correct.
- 23 Q. It says here at the top of the page "TOBACCO
- 24 RESEARCH IN BAT INDUSTRIES, " doesn't it?
- 25 A. It does, yes.

- 1 Q. And then it says in the first sentence "BATCo
- 2 has been charged by BAT Industries to define and to
- 3 progress towards R&D objectives which will give BAT"
- 4 an -- "a competitive lead in the market place";
- 5 correct?
- 6 A. That's what the first sentence says, but I would
- 7 like to add that the document is headed "DRAFT."
- 8 Q. All right. Sir, do you have any information
- 9 as -- no, strike that.
- 10 Isn't it a fact that not only was B.A.T.
- 11 Industries charging BATCO with defining and
- 12 progressing -- no, strike that.
- 13 Isn't it also true that the Tobacco Strategy
- 14 Review Team reviewed plans for proposed fundamental
- 15 research and approved or disapproved those plans?
- MS. McGARRY: I object. It's beyond the
- 17 scope of the witness's knowledge as he indicated
- 18 yesterday, and you've already deposed someone on the
- 19 TSRT and asked him about it.
- 20 If you know, you may answer.
- 21 A. I -- I -- I don't know the answer to that, but I
- 22 would like to read this document, please, if you're
- 23 going to ask me questions on it.
- 24 Q. I'm not going to ask you any further questions
- 25 on it, sir. Could you turn back to Exhibit 531 and

- 1 turn to the eighth page. That page is headed "Note
- 2 for Tobacco Strategy Review Team Meeting, Proposed
- 3 Group Fundamental Research Programme and Budget";
- 4 right?
- 5 A. That's what the page is headed, yes.
- 6 Q. All right. Why don't you take a moment and read
- 7 this page, sir.
- 8 (Witness reviews Plaintiffs' Exhibit 531.)
- 9 MS. McGARRY: When you're done, I'll take a
- 10 look at it, please.
- 11 (Witness continues reviewing Plaintiffs'
- 12 Exhibit 531.)
- MS. McGARRY: Thank you.
- 14 (Ms. McGarry reviews Plaintiffs'
- 15 Exhibit 531.)
- MS. McGARRY: Okay.
- 17 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 18 Q. Sir, you have now read the proposed Group
- 19 Function Research Programme memo; correct?
- 20 A. "Proposed Group Fundamental Research
- 21 Programme" --
- 22 Q. Thank you.
- 23 A. -- "and Budget."
- 24 Q. You've now read it, sir, haven't you?
- 25 A. Yes, I have.

- 1 Q. This document was written by Alan Heard?
- 2 A. I -- I imagine it was. It bears his name at the
- 3 bottom. It's not signed. It's dated 2nd November
- 4 1989.
- 5 Q. And it sets forth proposed projects for the
- 6 Group Fundamental Research Programme; right?
- 7 MS. McGARRY: I'm just going to object on
- 8 the grounds it's beyond the scope of the notice,
- 9 irrelevant to jurisdiction.
- 10 A. The second paragraph states "The proposed Group
- 11 Fundamental Research Programme covers the following
- 12 (topics" -- "the following (topics" little Roman "i
- 13 to" little Roman "vi are on-going and were agreed at
- 14 the 1989 R&D conference and topics vii to x," Roman
- 15 vii to Roman x, "are recommended as a result of
- 16 restructuring)." And then it lists a number of
- 17 projects, i through x.
- 18 Q. And this memo was presented to the Tobacco
- 19 Strategy Review Team for its approval; correct?
- 20 A. I think that's something of a
- 21 mischaracterization of the document. I don't see in
- 22 here -- and correct me if I'm wrong, please, but I
- 23 don't see in here a request for sanction by the
- 24 Tobacco Strategy Review Team. This appears to me to
- 25 be a note by way of information, and in fact, if one

- 1 looks at the second paragraph of the document, which
- 2 I referred to earlier, it says "The proposed Group
- 3 Fundamental Research Programme covers the
- 4 following." It says "topics i to vi are on-going and
- 5 were agreed at the 1989 R&D," which I take to be
- 6 "research and development," research and development
- 7 "conference."
- 8 So clearly it's -- it's quite clear from the
- 9 face of the document that certainly with respect to
- 10 items i through vi, this is not a recommendation to
- 11 the TSRT to approve the program and budget.
- 12 Q. Sir, have you read the notes of the -- the
- 13 Tobacco Strategy Review Team meeting at which this
- 14 was presented?
- 15 A. I --
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, asked and answered
- 17 yesterday.
- 18 A. I have not.
- 19 Q. All right. Now it was clearly presented or
- 20 going to be presented according to the agenda that's
- 21 the first page of Exhibit 531; right?
- 22 MS. McGARRY: Objection. We're asking the
- 23 witness to speculate. This doesn't have anything to
- 24 do with jurisdiction. You're talking about BATCO
- 25 research, and you've already deposed someone about

- 1 the TSRT.
- 2 MS. WIVELL: I object to your violation of
- 3 the court's order.
- 4 MS. McGARRY: I'm not violating the order.
- 5 I'm listing my objections succinctly.
- 6 A. Could you please repeat the question.
- 7 Q. Certainly. It was presented to the Tobacco
- 8 Strategy Review Team, wasn't it, sir?
- 9 MS. McGARRY: Same objections.
- 10 A. I -- I -- I do not know. The -- if this paper
- 11 is the paper which is referred to in item number five
- 12 on the agenda --
- 13 Q. Item number five on the agenda states --
- MS. McGARRY: Please --
- 15 Q. -- "Proposed Group fundamental research
- 16 programme and budget," doesn't it, sir?
- 17 MS. McGARRY: Excuse me. I don't think the
- 18 witness had finished his answer. Had you?
- 19 THE WITNESS: I hadn't, no, in fact.
- 20 MS. McGARRY: Okay. We'll go back to --
- 21 I'll read you the question and the answer up to as
- 22 far as you'd gotten. The question was: "It was
- 23 presented to the Tobacco Strategy Review Team, wasn't
- 24 it, sir?" And you said, "I ... do not know. The --
- 25 if this paper is the paper which is referred to in

- 1 item number five on the agenda --"
- 2 A. I would have continued: Then it is not
- 3 unreasonable to assume that it was presented, but I
- 4 have not seen the minutes that followed the proposed
- 5 meeting, so I cannot say for sure.
- 6 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 634 was marked
- 7 for identification.)
- 8 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 9 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 10 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 634, this is a document bearing
- 11 the Bates number 201831067; right?
- 12 A. Yes, it is.
- 13 Q. And it is the minutes of the 12th meeting of the
- 14 Tobacco Strategy Review Team held on November 10th,
- 15 1989?
- 16 A. Yes, that's what it appears to be.
- 17 Q. And if we go back to Exhibit 531, Mr. Heard's
- 18 memo was dated November 2nd, 1989, right, on the
- 19 ninth page of the document?
- 20 A. Sorry, I'm just trying to find the right --
- 21 Q. Yeah.
- 22 A. Mr. Heard's memo was --
- 23 Mr. Heard's paper was dated 2nd November 1989.
- 24 Q. And if we go back to the first page of
- 25 Exhibit 531, there is a agenda for the meeting of the

- 1 Tobacco Strategy Review Team to be held on
- 2 November 10th, 1989; right?
- 3 A. I think that's a fair characterization, yes.
- 4 Q. So Exhibit 634 would be the minutes of the
- 5 meeting that were held that correspond with the
- 6 agenda on the first page of Exhibit 531?
- 7 MS. McGARRY: Objection. The document
- 8 speaks for itself. You're asking the witness things
- 9 beyond his personal knowledge and you've already
- 10 deposed someone on the TSRT.
- 11 MS. WIVELL: Well I'm not deposing the
- 12 witness personally. I'm deposing B.A.T. Industries,
- 13 Counsel, so I suggest you keep that in mind.
- 14 A. Assuming these are not a draft, they would
- 15 appear to be the minutes of the 12th meeting of the
- 16 Tobacco Strategy Review Team held on 10th November
- 17 1989.
- 18 Q. And isn't it a fact that at this meeting the
- 19 Tobacco Strategy Review Team accepted the proposal
- 20 made by Mr. Heard that is listed in his memo which is
- 21 on the eighth and ninth pages of Exhibit 531?
- MS. McGARRY: Same objections.
- 23 A. I'd like to please take time to read these
- 24 minutes. I haven't seen them before, and if you're
- 25 asking me questions, I really do need to read the --

- 1 read the minutes.
- 2 Q. Let me direct your attention to point 27,
- 3 please. Feel free to read that page.
- 4 MS. McGARRY: No, feel free to read any
- 5 page you feel you need to read to answer questions on
- 6 the exhibit.
- 7 (Witness reviews exhibits.)
- 8 A. Could you let me have the question again,
- 9 please.
- 10 MS. McGARRY: I'm just first also going to
- 11 direct the witness's attention to paragraph 25, which
- 12 refers to Mr. Heard's fundamental research.
- 13 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that the Tobacco Strategy
- 14 Review Team approved or accepted the proposals which
- 15 Mr. Heard wrote -- I'm sorry, which Mr. Heard
- 16 presented to them?
- 17 MS. McGARRY: Objection, overbroad and the
- 18 other objections I've previously made.
- MS. WIVELL: Which I haven't a clue what
- 20 they are, so please state them.
- MS. McGARRY: The document speaks for
- 22 itself; the witness has no knowledge; and B.A.T.
- 23 Industries has already produced to you an individual
- 24 knowledgable about the TSRT, who you have deposed on
- 25 this subject.

- 1 A. Well I said in a previous answer that this did
- 2 not appear to me to be a request for approval from
- 3 the TSRT, and while you directed my attention to
- 4 minute 27, the relevant minute in regard to the
- 5 document that you're asking me questions about, which
- 6 comes from Exhibit 531, appears to be covered by in
- 7 fact minute 25.
- 8 Q. And in fact there at --
- 9 A. I hadn't --
- 10 Q. Oh, I'm sorry.
- 11 A. I'm sorry, excuse me.
- 12 Q. You stopped so I --
- 13 A. I hadn't -- I hadn't finished my -- yeah, I
- 14 hadn't finished my answer.
- 15 Q. -- assumed you were done.
- 16 A. Can you just read back to me what I just said,
- 17 please.
- 18 MS. McGARRY: "Well" as "I said in a
- 19 previous answer that this did not appear to me to be
- 20 a request for approval from the TSRT, and while you
- 21 directed my attention to minute 27, the relevant
- 22 minute in regard to the document that you're asking
- 23 me questions about, which comes from Exhibit 531,
- 24 appears to be covered" in fact by "minute 25."
- 25 A. Of the Exhibit 634, and what minute 25 says is

- 1 that the team supported the program and -- and the
- 2 proposed allocation of charges. It doesn't say that
- 3 the team approved the program, and I'd also just like
- 4 to refer to the team. And these minutes are dated
- 5 1989, and the team includes people who were at that
- 6 time the -- the membership appears at any rate to
- 7 include people who were at that time the chief
- 8 executive officers of Brown & Williamson; of B.A.T.
- 9 Cigarettenfabriken, which is a German operation, a
- 10 German company manufacturing tobacco products; of
- 11 Souza Cruz, which is a Brazilian company
- 12 manufacturing tobacco products, all of which are
- 13 subsidiaries of -- ultimately owned by B.A.T.
- 14 Industries and were ultimately owned by B.A.T.
- 15 Industries at that time; of Mr. John Louie Mercier,
- 16 who was I believe at that time the chief executive of
- 17 Imperial Tobacco Canada; Mr. B. D. Bramley, who was
- 18 the chief executive officer of British-American
- 19 Tobacco; and also in attendance were Mr. Hank Frigon,
- 20 who was the president and -- I think he was the
- 21 president of BATUS, the holding company in the U.S.
- 22 of Brown & Williamson; and Mr. Rombaut, who was
- 23 connected with Souza Cruz; and Mr. Crawford, who I
- 24 believe at that time was the chairman of Imasco, the
- 25 Canadian corporation which is the parent company of

- 1 Imperial Tobacco.
- 2 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive. Sir, the
- 3 minutes --
- 4 MS. McGARRY: If you'd like, we can just
- 5 stipulate that you don't have to make that motion;
- 6 it's preserved for all answers.
- 7 Q. Sir, the minutes state that the team supported
- 8 the program; correct?
- 9 A. The team supported the -- the program.
- 10 Q. And you have no knowledge as you sit here today
- 11 of anything contrary to that, do you, sir?
- 12 A. I have -- I don't really understand the
- 13 question. The words, I think, speak for themselves.
- 14 "The team supported the programme," that's what the
- 15 words say.
- 16 Q. And sitting here today, you have no information
- 17 to the contrary, do you, sir?
- 18 A. To the contrary, that the team did not support
- 19 the program?
- 20 Q. That's right.
- 21 A. I have no knowledge to -- to that effect, no.
- 22 Q. Now, also the Tobacco Strategy Review Team heard
- 23 a presentation on the organization and structure of
- 24 R&D for tobacco; right?
- 25 A. It says it in minute 27, "Mr. Heard presented a

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES

P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 paper on the Structure and Organisation of R&D for
- 2 tobacco."
- 3 Q. And those recommendations were accepted by the
- 4 team, weren't they?
- 5 A. The main recommendations of the paper, the main
- 6 recommendations of the paper, whatever they may be --
- 7 I haven't seen them -- were accepted.
- 8 Q. And you have no information that contradicts the
- 9 fact that --
- 10 A. Could I --
- 11 Q. Excuse me.
- 12 A. Sorry, I --
- 13 Q. May I finish?
- 14 A. I hadn't finished my previous answer.
- 15 Q. Oh, I'm sorry.
- 16 A. I do -- I do --
- 17 Q. When you stop, sir, it's hard for me to -- to
- 18 read your mind and know that you're going to start
- 19 again.
- 20 A. Sorry, I'm -- I'm --
- MS. McGARRY: Well he's just pausing, so
- 22 maybe you could give more time to make sure the
- 23 answers are done or ask if it's unclear.
- 24 THE WITNESS: Can -- please could you just
- 25 read back to me what I had answered.

- 1 MS. McGARRY: "The main recommendations of
- 2 the paper, the main recommendations of the paper,
- 3 whatever they may be -- I haven't seen them -- were
- 4 accepted.
- 5 "And you have no information that contradicts
- 6 the fact that --" and then excuse me, can I finish,
- 7 you said. So it ended with "I haven't seen" --
- 8 A. And I was going to go on to say: "... and it
- 9 was noted" -- and I'm quoting from the document --
- 10 "... and it was noted that" the -- "that resulting
- 11 from the proposals, Group fundamental research would
- 12 be concentrated at Southampton."
- 13 Q. Now, sir, the Tobacco Strategy Review Team had
- 14 previously approved Project GREENDOT and Project
- 15 AIRBUS; isn't that true?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 17 A. I -- I -- I simply don't know.
- 18 MS. McGARRY: Can I get these out of
- 19 Mr. Wilson's way or will you be going back to them?
- MS. WIVELL: That's fine.
- 21 MS. McGARRY: There's a lot of paper in
- 22 front of him. Okay.
- 23 Excuse me.
- 24 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 635 was marked
- for identification.)

- 1 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 2 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 3 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 635, this is a memo that begins
- 4 with the Bates number 650900469; right?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. I would like the record to reflect this document
- 7 was previously marked, but I made a mistake and wrote
- 8 down the wrong exhibit number and so I don't have the
- 9 correct exhibit number for the previously marked
- 10 exhibit, but it has previously been marked in this
- 11 litigation.
- 12 Sir, this memo concerns a meeting held on the
- 13 4th and 5th of January 1988 at the JFK Hilton in New
- 14 York City; correct?
- 15 A. Can I just check that this document isn't in
- 16 fact marked -- it appears to be marked "DRAFT" or
- 17 something like that in the top right-hand corner.
- 18 Q. I think it says "SECRET," doesn't it, sir?
- 19 A. Does it? Okay. I -- I can't tell from the copy
- 20 that's been provided. It's --
- 21 MS. McGARRY: It's -- it's very difficult
- 22 to read the stamp.
- 23 Q. Sir, let me repeat my question.
- 24 This meeting concerns -- I'm sorry, strike
- 25 that.

- 1 This memo concerns a meeting held on the 4th and
- 2 5th of January of 1988 at the JFK Hilton in New York
- 3 City; correct?
- 4 MS. McGARRY: I object. It's irrelevant to
- 5 the scope of the deposition.
- 6 A. It appears from its face to be notes of a
- 7 meeting so held.
- 8 Q. All right. I'm going to be referring to -- or
- 9 I'm going to be asking questions about the first
- 10 page, so would you take a moment and read it,
- 11 please.
- 12 (Witness reviews Plaintiffs' Exhibit 635.)
- 13 A. I'm going to read the whole document. I'm not
- 14 going to answer questions on the first page out of
- 15 context.
- 16 Q. Fine, go ahead.
- 17 MS. McGARRY: And I'm going to make an
- 18 objection to your asking any questions of Mr. Wilson
- 19 of this document. It's a Brown & Williamson document
- 20 about a meeting that, as far as I know, no one from
- 21 B.A.T. Industries attended, and I don't think it's
- 22 anything that Mr. Wilson has knowledge of and I don't
- 23 think it's anything that's related to jurisdiction,
- 24 so it's beyond the scope of the deposition.
- MS. WIVELL: I disagree.

- 1 (Witness continues reviewing Plaintiffs'
- 2 Exhibit 635.)
- 3 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 4 Q. Sir, you've now taken the time to read the
- 5 entire Exhibit 635; right?
- 6 A. I have.
- 7 Q. The document concerns a meeting that was held in
- 8 New York to discuss Projects GREENDOT and AIRBUS;
- 9 right?
- 10 MS. McGARRY: Objection. The document
- 11 speaks for itself. You may answer.
- 12 A. The document appears to concern a meeting held
- 13 in New York on the 4th and 5th of January 1988
- 14 between representatives of Brown & Williamson, B.A.T.
- 15 Cigarettenfabriken, Imperial Tobacco Canada, BATUKE
- 16 and BATCO, all of which are companies which
- 17 manufacture and market tobacco products, and I don't
- 18 see any representative from B.A.T. Industries.
- 19 Q. I'm sorry, sir. Did you hear me ask whether
- 20 there was a representative from B.A.T. Industries?
- 21 MS. McGARRY: I'm going to direct the
- 22 witness not to answer that question on the grounds
- 23 that it's argumentative.
- MS. WIVELL: Well I'm going to move to
- 25 strike the answer as completely inappropriate and

- 1 nonresponsive.
- 2 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 3 Q. Sir, the meet -- purpose of the meeting was to
- 4 discuss the progress on two research proposals;
- 5 right?
- 6 MS. McGARRY: Objection. The document
- 7 speaks for itself, beyond the knowledge of the
- 8 witness, irrelevant to jurisdiction, which is the
- 9 subject of this deposition.
- 10 A. If I may quote from the document itself, the
- 11 very first paragraph, "The purpose of the meeting was
- 12 to progress the research proposals for highly
- 13 modified cigarette design, "brackets, "(Project
- 14 GREENDOT), " close bracket, "and completely new
- 15 alternative products, "bracket, "(Project AIRBUS), "
- 16 close bracket, "strongly endorsed by the Research
- 17 Policy Group Meeting held in Louisville in September
- 18 1987," and Louisville, I would point out, is the --
- 19 where the headquarters of Brown & Williamson Tobacco
- 20 Corporation are and were at that time located.
- 21 Q. And the proposals for those two research
- 22 projects had been accepted by the Tobacco Strategy
- 23 Review Team; isn't that true?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, same objections as
- 25 I raised to the previous question.

- 1 A. The second paragraph of the document reads
- 2 "These proposals had been accepted in principle by
- 3 the TSRT as appropriate for the development of new
- 4 products for the 1990's."
- 5 Q. Now, sir, you have no information that the
- 6 proposals were not accepted in principle by the
- 7 Tobacco Strategy Review Team?
- 8 MS. McGARRY: Same objections.
- 9 A. I have no knowledge one way or the other.
- 10 Q. Now, the B.A.T. Industries board approved a
- 11 group technology review for the tobacco side of the
- 12 group business; correct?
- 13 A. Can you just give me the -- the question again,
- 14 please.
- 15 Q. Certainly. The B.A.T. Industries board approved
- 16 a group technology review for the tobacco side of the
- 17 group's business; isn't that true?
- 18 A. You -- if you can help me with the date, I -- I
- 19 don't know.
- 20 Q. Well since you've become company -- company
- 21 secretary, the B.A.T. Industries board has approved a
- 22 group technology review, hasn't it, sir?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, assumes facts not
- 24 in evidence.
- 25 A. The board of B.A.T. Industries receives a report

- 1 on technology in the group of companies that comprise
- 2 the subsidiaries of B.A.T. Industries. It receives a
- 3 periodic review.
- 4 Could you -- I can't remember what your question
- 5 was actually.
- 6 Q. It receives a yearly review, doesn't it, sir?
- 7 A. It, I believe, receives a yearly review.
- 8 Q. And in fact, it either approves or disapproves
- 9 that yearly review, doesn't it, sir?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 11 A. I believe, if you consult the minutes of the
- 12 board, you will see that the board notes the review.
- 13 It neither approves nor disapproves. It may raise
- 14 concerns or issues about matters contained within the
- 15 review, but I don't think the board actually approves
- 16 or disapproves.
- 17 O. Well it makes recommendations based on that
- 18 review, doesn't it, sir?
- 19 A. It may make recommendations based on that
- 20 review.
- 21 Q. And in fact, since you've been company
- 22 secretary, the board has made recommendations to the
- 23 tobacco side of the group business based on its
- 24 review of the group technology report?
- 25 A. I think I would have to refresh my memory from

- 1 looking at the minutes of the meetings of the board
- 2 of B.A.T. Industries.
- 3 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 636 was marked
- 4 for identification.)
- 5 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 6 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 7 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 636, this is a document that
- 8 begins with Bates number 482100366; right?
- 9 A. Correct.
- 10 Q. The front page is a memo from Hilary Barton to
- 11 Nick Brookes and showing a copy to Earl Kohnhorst;
- 12 correct?
- 13 A. Yes. It is, yes.
- 14 Q. And the subject is the technology review we've
- 15 just been talking about; right?
- 16 A. I don't think you identified any particular
- 17 technology review when we were speaking.
- 18 Q. Fair enough. The subject of the memo is a
- 19 technology -- a -- strike that.
- 20 The subject of the memo is a group technology
- 21 review which was discussed and approved at the group
- 22 board meeting on the 5th September; right?
- 23 A. In the words of the author of this note, the
- 24 subject is the "Group Technology Review which was
- 25 discussed and approved at the Group Board meeting on"

- 1 the "5th" of "September," and as I have previously
- 2 said, I do not know whether the group approved
- 3 anything specifically or in fact whether, as is more
- 4 likely in my view, the group noted the technology
- 5 review.
- 6 And if in fact they approved anything, I would
- 7 have to read the document to determine what they were
- 8 being asked to approve. And you'll appreciate, I'm
- 9 sure, that given the tens of thousands of documents
- 10 that come across my desk every year and hundreds of
- 11 documents that the board of B.A.T. Industries
- 12 probably reviews every year or considers or notes
- 13 every year, that I can't possibly be expected here
- 14 and now to give you an affirmative answer as to
- 15 whether the board approved recommendations or
- 16 approved anything in this document. I will need to
- 17 read the document.
- 18 Q. All right. This is a -- I'm sorry, strike
- 19 that.
- The second page of the document is entitled
- 21 "SECRET, B.A.T INDUSTRIES, GROUP TECHNOLOGY REVIEW,
- 22 1995"; right?
- 23 A. The second page of the exhibit, yes, is so
- 24 entitled.
- 25 Q. All right. Now, sir, there are recommendations

- 1 set forth at -- on the fourth page of the document;
- 2 right?
- 3 A. I'm going to ask, please, to read this page --
- 4 Q. Fine, that's fine.
- 5 A. -- before I answer.
- 6 MS. WIVELL: And I would like to take a
- 7 break.
- 8 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 9 (Recess taken.)
- 10 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 11 Q. Sir, there are recommendations set forth on the
- 12 fourth page of Exhibit 363 -- I'm sorry, strike
- 13 that.
- 14 There are recommendations set forth on the
- 15 fourth page of Exhibit 636; right?
- 16 A. Could you just refer me, please, to the Bates --
- 17 the relevant Bates number of the page you're
- 18 referring to.
- 19 Q. Certainly, the page that ends with number 369.
- 20 Let me rephrase my question.
- MS. McGARRY: Excuse me.
- 22 Q. There are recommendations set forth on the
- 23 fourth page of Exhibit 636; right?
- 24 A. The document --
- MS. McGARRY: I'm --

- 1 THE WITNESS: Shall we --
- 2 MS. McGARRY: I'm sorry. Mr. Wilson's
- 3 using the copy you gave me, not the original, and
- 4 these seem to have --
- 5 THE WITNESS: You've got a --
- 6 MS. McGARRY: -- different Bates numbers,
- 7 so that's probably what's causing the confusion. Why
- 8 don't we switch. Mr. Wilson's copy starts with 469.
- 9 THE WITNESS: I think you've got it -- no,
- 10 369. You're looking at the wrong exhibit.
- MS. WIVELL: You're looking at the wrong
- 12 exhibit.
- 13 MS. McGARRY: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm on the --
- 14 no wonder.
- MS. WIVELL: Let me try again.
- MS. McGARRY: I apologize. No wonder the
- 17 numbers didn't match up. Okay.
- 18 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 19 Q. There are recommendations set forth on the
- 20 fourth page of Exhibit 636, aren't there, sir?
- 21 A. The fourth page of the exhibit refers in fact to
- 22 a review, "The last review of this type took place in
- 23 September 1993," and then continues after -- if I may
- 24 leave out some words, continues "The main
- 25 recommendations were that." So this appears to me to

- 1 be a reference back to recommendations which arose
- 2 from a review which was carried out in September
- 3 1993.
- 4 Q. Well, sir, that's in a different paragraph than
- 5 the paragraph concerning the main recommendation,
- 6 isn't it, sir?
- 7 MS. McGARRY: Objection, document speaks
- 8 for itself. You may answer.
- 9 A. The document speaks for itself, and also
- 10 paragraph 1.4 of the document says "The main
- 11 recommendations were." It does not say "The main
- 12 recommendations are." It is definitely -- to me at
- 13 any rate from reading this document, this is a
- 14 reference back to recommendations which arose out of
- 15 the review that took place in September 1993. That's
- 16 what the document says.
- 17 Q. And the recommendation that's made there, it
- 18 refers to the Tobacco Strategy Group sponsoring a
- 19 detailed review of the opportunities to improve the
- 20 global management of the group's tobacco business;
- 21 right?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, mischaracterizes
- 23 the document and the witness's prior testimony. You
- 24 may answer.
- 25 A. Could you read back the question, please.

- 1 Q. Certainly. And the recommendation that's made
- 2 there refers to the group -- to -- strike that.
- 3 And the recommendation that's referred to there
- 4 is that the Tobacco Strategy Group should sponsor a
- 5 detailed review of the opportunities to improve the
- 6 global management of the tobacco business; right?
- 7 A. One of the recommendations that appears to have
- 8 come out of the review that took place in 1993 was,
- 9 as is stated in the document, that "the Tobacco
- 10 Strategy Group should sponsor a detailed review of
- 11 the opportunities to improve the global management of
- 12 the Tobacco business by" -- and it goes on to state
- 13 by doing a number of things. And one of the other
- 14 recommendations there is that "the role of the
- 15 Financial Services Strategy Group should be
- 16 strengthened to identify the opportunities to add
- 17 value, to avoid duplication of effort and to speed up
- 18 developments, by sharing resources."
- 19 Q. Now the Tobacco Strategy Group had done that
- 20 review, hadn't they?
- 21 A. I --
- MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 23 A. I -- I don't know.
- 24 Q. Well if we turn to the page that ends with Bates
- 25 number 371, there's reference to Project Battalion,

- 1 isn't there, sir?
- 2 A. There is a reference to Project Battalion.
- 3 Q. And Project Battalion was a project that was
- 4 done based on the review that's referred here?
- 5 A. I think that's, if I may respectfully say, a
- 6 misrepresentation of what the document says.
- 7 Q. I'm -- sir, I'm not asking you what the document
- 8 says. I'm asking you if Project Battalion arose out
- 9 of the work that was done by the Tobacco Strategy
- 10 Group that's referred to here.
- MS. McGARRY: Had you finished your
- 12 previous answer, Mr. Wilson?
- THE WITNESS: No, I hadn't.
- MS. McGARRY: All right. Well complete
- 15 that. "I think that's, if I may respectfully say, a
- 16 misrepresentation of what the document says."
- 17 A. Among the items identified in the 1993 review in
- 18 respect of which appreciable progress has -- has been
- 19 made, according to this document, it says that
- 20 "reports" had been -- "have been developed and
- 21 presented to the TSG on Group-wide brand and market
- 22 profitability, for major brands and markets. This
- 23 work has formed the basis for the management
- 24 information system which is being developed as part
- 25 of" -- and I'd emphasize the words "as part of" --

- 1 "Project Battalion for the new Tobacco organisation
- 2 structure."
- 3 Q. Now Project Battalion was a project that was
- 4 developed and put into place by B.A.T. Industries,
- 5 wasn't it, sir?
- 6 MS. McGARRY: I'm going to object on
- 7 relevance because it goes beyond the institution of
- 8 this litigation in time, but I will permit the
- 9 witness to answer.
- 10 Do you need the question again?
- 11 THE WITNESS: Yes, please.
- MS. McGARRY: "Now Project Battalion was a
- 13 project that was developed and put into place by
- 14 B.A.T. Industries, wasn't it, sir?"
- 15 A. Project Battalion was a -- a project which
- 16 involved both B.A.T. Industries and representatives
- 17 from a number of the companies in the group which
- 18 manufacture and market tobacco products.
- 19 Q. And the project was put into effect, wasn't it,
- 20 sir?
- 21 A. I think I've just testified that Project
- 22 Battalion -- there was a project called Project
- 23 Battalion and that it was a project carried out with
- 24 involvement by people from B.A.T. Industries and from
- 25 the tobacco operating companies.

- 1 Q. And Project Battalion led to the transfer of the
- 2 responsibility for the management of the worldwide
- 3 tobacco business to British-American Tobacco Company
- 4 Holdings as of the 1st of -- of January 1996; right?
- 5 MS. McGARRY: Objection, assumes facts not
- 6 in evidence.
- 7 A. Following on from Project Battalion, a company
- 8 then known as Staines Investments Limited, which was
- 9 incorporated in 1932 and was at that time the
- 10 intermediate parent company of British-American
- 11 Tobacco Company Limited, BATCO, changed its name to
- 12 British-American Tobacco Holdings Limited, and its
- 13 board was reconstituted and the board was vested with
- 14 certain strategic management responsibilities for the
- 15 purposes of essentially carrying forward a vision, a
- 16 strategic vision, which was that the companies in the
- 17 group that manufacture and market tobacco products
- 18 should seek to regain the number-one position, a
- 19 position which had been lost over time to Philip
- 20 Morris.
- 21 Q. Just so we're clear, that took place on or about
- 22 January 1st, 1996; right?
- 23 A. Yes, that's -- that's fair, yes.
- 24 Q. Fine. And would it be fair to say that Project
- 25 Battalion led to this -- I'm not sure how you

- 1 described it in your last answer -- strategic
- 2 management change that occurred in January 1996?
- 3 A. I think that's a fair characterization, yes.
- 4 Q. So it would be fair to say, wouldn't it, sir,
- 5 that what is referred to here in the page that ends
- 6 with Bates number 371 of Exhibit 636, the reference
- 7 to the work done in part by the TSG or presented to
- 8 the TSG formed the basis for that change of
- 9 management responsibility that we've been talking
- 10 about that occurred at the first of the year in
- 11 1996?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection to the form of the
- 13 question.
- 14 A. I have to say that I think you're drawing
- 15 certain conclusions which certainly on their face
- 16 don't seem to be the case. The document doesn't --
- 17 doesn't of itself support it. I -- if I can just
- 18 refer you back to the wording here -- and it may be
- 19 that I've misunderstood your -- your question, but
- 20 what the wording here talks about is it talks about
- 21 reports having been developed and presented to the
- 22 TSG, not prepared by the TSG, having been
- 23 developed -- if I can finish my answer, please,
- 24 having been developed and presented to the TSG on
- 25 group-wide brand and market profitability for major

- 1 brands and markets and that that work, the work which
- 2 formed the basis of those reports which had been
- 3 presented to the TSG and not carried out by the TSG,
- 4 had formed the basis for certainly a management
- 5 information system which was at the time this paper
- 6 was produced -- I think in September 1995 -- being
- 7 developed as part of Project Battalion for the new
- 8 tobacco organization structure.
- 9 It does not necessarily follow from that that
- 10 this management information system which is being
- 11 referred to here, for which that work formed the
- 12 basis, was necessarily the system that came into
- 13 effect as a result of the implementation of Project
- 14 Battalion.
- 15 Q. And I -- I think there may have been some
- 16 miscommunication because I'm just trying to establish
- 17 that what's discussed here was part of the process
- 18 that ended up being implemented the 1st of
- 19 December -- or the 1st of January of 1996. You would
- 20 agree with that, wouldn't you, sir?
- 21 A. That it was one of the matters that was being
- 22 developed in connection with the process that ended
- 23 up --
- 24 Q. Yes.
- 25 A. -- with Battalion? I think that's a

- 1 reasonable --
- 2 Q. Okay.
- 3 A. -- conclusion to draw from this.
- 4 Q. And you would agree, sir, that the B.A.T.
- 5 Industries board had a leading role in making sure
- 6 that that process which ended up with -- with the
- 7 change that we've been discussing on the 1st of
- 8 December 19 -- or the 1st of January 1996 -- let me
- 9 rephrase the question.
- 10 And you would agree, sir, that the B.A.T.
- 11 Industries board had a leading role in implementing
- 12 that process which ended up with the change we've
- 13 been discussing on the 1st of January of 1996?
- 14 A. The board of B.A.T. Industries was well aware of
- 15 Project Battalion. Certain members of the board of
- 16 B.A.T. Industries took a more direct involvement in
- 17 the project, yeah.
- 18 Q. All right. And the board of B.A.T. Industries
- 19 approved the Project Battalion; correct?
- 20 A. They --
- 21 MS. McGARRY: Objection to the form. You
- 22 may answer.
- 23 A. The -- the -- the board of B.A.T. Industries
- 24 certainly approved the reconstitution of the board of
- 25 British-American Tobacco Holdings with effect from

- 1 the 1st of January 1996, noted the various
- 2 appointments that were being made and noted the
- 3 strategic rationale for -- for that, which -- and if
- 4 I may actually just continue that answer, which is
- 5 not at all surprising given that what we are talking
- 6 about is one-half of the -- the business which is
- 7 managed by the companies that the group controls.
- 8 I have previously testified that B.A.T.
- 9 Industries is a -- an investment company holding
- 10 investments in a very substantial number of
- 11 subsidiaries which are now essentially in two
- 12 business lines, one of which is tobacco and one of
- 13 which is insurance/financial services, and it's
- 14 therefore, to my mind, not at all surprising that
- 15 B.A.T. Industries would be involved in any proposal
- 16 for a strategic development concerning the -- the
- 17 proposal to regain the number-one position in terms
- 18 of the -- you know, the -- in terms of tobacco.
- 19 Q. Now, sir, you told me that certain members of
- 20 the board of B.A.T. Industries took a more direct
- 21 involvement in the project; right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Well who were those board members?
- 24 A. They would be the members of the Chief
- 25 Executive's Committee.

- 1 Q. And who were they at the time that Battalion was
- 2 being implemented?
- 3 A. When you -- when you -- sorry, I don't
- 4 understand Battalion being implemented.
- 5 Q. All right. Well let me rephrase it this way:
- 6 Who were the board members who had direct involvement
- 7 in the change that took place January 1st, 1996?
- 8 A. Well I think I've testified previously that
- 9 the -- the board of B.A.T. Industries was aware and
- 10 noted the changes that were taking effect on 1st of
- 11 January 1996.
- 12 Q. And I'm --
- 13 You had also said, and I quote, "Certain members
- 14 of the board of B.A.T. Industries took a more direct
- 15 involvement in the project," and I'm trying to find
- 16 out which one of the board members or which ones of
- 17 the board members you were referring to when you gave
- 18 me that answer.
- 19 A. Thank you, you've -- you've clarified your
- 20 earlier question. If you're talking about the
- 21 project which led to the changes on the 1st of
- 22 January 1996, then the directors who had a more close
- 23 involvement than the rest of the board were the
- 24 members of the Chief Executive's Committee, who were
- 25 Martin Broughton, Ulrich Herter and David Allvey.

- 1 Q. And what were their involvement in the project?
- 2 A. Their involvement was that they would
- 3 periodically receive reports from the project team as
- 4 to how matters were progressing and the sort of
- 5 responses that were being received from -- from
- 6 interviewees. That -- that would be the nature of
- 7 their involvement.
- 8 Q. When you refer to "the project team," to what
- 9 are you referring?
- 10 MS. McGARRY: Can I just have a continuing
- 11 objection to this line of questions as irrelevant?
- MS. WIVELL: Certainly, but con --
- 13 considering that this all took place -- or not all,
- 14 but that much of this activity took place in the
- 15 years preceding the institution of this lawsuit, I
- 16 think your objection is misplaced.
- 17 MS. McGARRY: I thought this lawsuit was
- 18 commenced in 1994, not 1996.
- 19 MS. WIVELL: That's right.
- 20 MS. McGARRY: All right. So my only
- 21 question was can I have a continuing objection or --
- MS. WIVELL: I said you could, yes.
- MS. McGARRY: Oh, thank you. Please don't
- 24 interrupt me again. I'll reread the question for the
- 25 witness.

- 1 MS. WIVELL: Why don't I restate the
- 2 question for the witness.
- 3 MS. McGARRY: You can rephrase it if you'd
- 4 like.
- 5 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 6 Q. Who was on the project team?
- 7 A. I'm afraid I can't give you the names of all the
- 8 members of the project team, but I can certainly
- 9 recall some of the names of the members of the
- 10 project team. I believe I'm right in saying that the
- 11 project team was headed by Keith Dunt.
- 12 Q. And to who -- or I'm sorry.
- 13 By whom was he employed?
- 14 A. British-American Tobacco Company, BATCO.
- 15 Q. And representatives of Brown & Williamson were
- 16 also involved in the project team; correct?
- 17 A. As members of the project team specifically,
- 18 I -- I -- I simply cannot recall. I believe a
- 19 representative of Souza Cruz was a member of the
- 20 project team, but I can't recall specifically.
- 21 Q. Wasn't Earl Kohnhorst a member of the team?
- 22 A. Yes, I believe he was. I can't confirm that
- 23 definitely. I -- you may -- you may well be right.
- 24 Q. All right. There were also lawyers from B.A.T.
- 25 Industries who were involved in that project, weren't

- 1 there, sir?
- 2 MS. McGARRY: Objection, assumes facts not
- 3 in evidence. You may answer.
- 4 A. One lawyer who was employed in B.A.T. Industries
- 5 was a member of the project team, yes, you're right.
- 6 Q. Who was that?
- 7 A. Neil Withington.
- 8 Q. Now, sir, lawyers from B.A.T. Industries have
- 9 participated in addition to the work on that project
- 10 with representatives from Brown & Williamson in
- 11 developing or approving speeches and presentations
- 12 that were made on the subject of smoking and health;
- 13 isn't that true?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, assumes facts not
- 15 in evidence.
- 16 A. I'm sorry, could you read the question back to
- 17 me, please.
- 18 Q. Yes. Lawyers from B.A.T. Industries have
- 19 participated in developing or approving speeches and
- 20 presentations that have been made on the subject of
- 21 smoking and health?
- MS. McGARRY: Same objection.
- 23 A. Well I do not know the answer to that question,
- 24 but I -- I do know that it would -- and I'm sure it's
- 25 the case that -- but I can't think of a -- you know,

- 1 a specific example, but I'm -- you know, I'm quite
- 2 sure that B.A.T. Industries, as the holding company
- 3 of the -- of the group of companies, would have
- 4 wanted to make itself aware of the, you know, public
- 5 positions on smoking and health that the companies
- 6 were taking. That would be a natural thing for a
- 7 holding company to want to do.
- 8 Q. Well, sir, I'm not talking about just making
- 9 themselves aware. I'm talking about approving the
- 10 details of presentations or speeches that have been
- 11 made by group employees on the issues of smoking and
- 12 health.
- MS. McGARRY: Do you want to pose a
- 14 question.
- 15 Q. That's occurred, hasn't it, sir?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, asked and
- 17 answered.
- 18 A. Can you repeat the question, please.
- 19 Q. Yes, sir. In addition to just making themselves
- 20 aware of what might have been said, isn't it a fact
- 21 that lawyers from B.A.T. Industries have helped
- 22 approve the details of presentations or speeches that
- 23 have been made by group employees on the issue of
- 24 smoking and health?
- 25 A. Well I'm not sure whether they have helped --

- 1 they have approved the details. They may well have
- 2 for all I know, and I -- and I don't know
- 3 specifically. They may well have been consulted on
- 4 wording, but I can't -- I don't know whether that
- 5 amounts to approval.
- 6 I'm not trying to be evasive. I just simply
- 7 don't really understand what you're getting at.
- 8 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 637 was marked
- 9 for identification.)
- 10 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 11 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 12 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 637, this is a document Bates
- 13 numbered 109841684; right?
- 14 A. Correct.
- 15 Q. This is a letter from L. C. F. Blackman, Lionel
- 16 Blackman, to Robert Sanford; right?
- 17 A. This appears to be a copy of a letter. It's not
- 18 signed. I do not know whether it was sent or
- 19 received.
- 20 Q. All right. You just don't know that one way or
- 21 the other, do you, sir?
- 22 A. I have no knowledge one way or the other.
- 23 Q. All right. This letter is dated May 19th,
- 24 1981.
- 25 A. This document bears the date 19th May 1981.

- 1 Q. All right. Why don't you take a moment and read
- 2 it.
- 3 A. Thank you.
- 4 (Witness reviews Plaintiffs' Exhibit 637.)
- 5 Q. Sir, you've now read the document?
- 6 A. Yes, I have.
- 7 Q. Lionel Blackman was at the time that this
- 8 document is dated the head of research and
- 9 development for BATCO; correct?
- 10 A. I don't know whether he was the head of research
- 11 and development. I believe he was employed in the
- 12 research and development function at Southampton.
- 13 Q. And he was actively involved in
- 14 smoking-and-health issues, wasn't he, sir?
- 15 A. Well given that, as I say, he was employed in
- 16 the research and development function, he would have
- 17 been involved in issues of research relating to
- 18 tobacco.
- 19 Q. All right. And --
- 20 MS. McGARRY: Just answer what you know.
- 21 You don't have to speculate.
- 22 MS. WIVELL: I object to your coaching the
- 23 witness. That was really inappropriate.
- 24 Q. Now, this document concerns a speech that
- 25 Mr. Blackman had -- or Dr. Blackman had been giving;

- 1 correct?
- 2 A. If I may read from the text, "Herewith at last
- 3 the re-print of a talk that covers the majority of
- 4 information that I have been presenting when talking
- 5 to various BAT Groups worldwide, " stop.
- 6 Q. And it goes on to say "This particular version
- 7 was approved in detail by Ernie Pepples and Wilson
- 8 Wyatt when they spent three days at Windsor House
- 9 with Lawyers and Public Affairs staff from BATCo and
- 10 Industries"; correct?
- 11 A. Yes, and the letter does say "This particular
- 12 version was approved in detail by Ernie Pepples and
- 13 Wilson Wyatt"
- 14 Q. Now Ernie --
- 15 A. Sorry, I hadn't finished my answer. Had been
- 16 approved in detail by Ernie Pepples and Wilson
- 17 Wyatt. It does not say that it was approved by
- 18 lawyers or public affairs staff from BATCO and
- 19 Industries. It says it was -- the document speaks
- 20 for itself. It says it was approved in detail by
- 21 Ernie Pepples and Wilson Wyatt.
- 22 Q. When they spent three days at Windsor House.
- 23 Now Windsor House is the headquarters of B.A.T.
- 24 Industries; right?
- 25 A. Windsor House is the headquarters building, yes,

- 1 of B.A.T. Industries.
- 2 Q. And it was approved at the time that they spent
- 3 three days at Windsor House with lawyers and public
- 4 affairs staff from BATCO and B.A.T. Industries;
- 5 right?
- 6 A. It doesn't specifically identify B.A.T.
- 7 Industries, but it does refer to a company called
- 8 Industries. But it also doesn't say what the subject
- 9 matter of the discussions with the lawyers and public
- 10 affairs staff from BATCO and Industries concerned,
- 11 and it does not follow from the words there that the
- 12 subject matter discussed was the reprint of the talk
- 13 which is referred to in the first sentence of the
- 14 paragraph.
- 15 Q. Sir, you don't know one way or the other as you
- 16 sit here today what that talk was about, do you?
- 17 A. No, of course I don't.
- 18 Q. And you have no information to dispute what's
- 19 written here in this document, do you?
- 20 A. I think I've just said what's written here in
- 21 the document, and of course I have no way to dispute
- 22 what's written in the document. And what the
- 23 document says is that the reprint was approved by
- 24 Ernie Pepples and Wilson Wyatt. It does not say that
- 25 the reprint was approved by the lawyers and public

- 1 affairs staff from BATCO and Industries. The
- 2 document does not say that.
- 3 Q. It was approved in detail by Ernie Pepples and
- 4 Wilson Wyatt when they spent three days at Windsor
- 5 House with lawyers and public affairs staff from
- 6 BATCO and Industries; right?
- 7 A. That is what the document says.
- 8 Q. Now, sir --
- 9 And as you sit here today, B.A.T. Industries has
- 10 no information to refute what's written here; right?
- 11 A. I have no information to dispute what is written
- 12 in that letter.
- 13 Q. Now, sir, isn't it a fact that lawyers from
- 14 B.A.T. Industries met with lawyers from Brown &
- 15 Williamson in 1984?
- 16 A. I believe it to be the case that lawyers from
- 17 B.A. -- or counsel representing B.A.T. Industries
- 18 have met with counsel for Brown & Williamson to
- 19 consider issues arising in the U.S. tobacco
- 20 litigation and to help plan their respective
- 21 defenses. I believe that to be the case.
- 22 Q. And you've seen documents to that effect, sir,
- 23 haven't you?
- 24 A. I'm not sure that I have seen documents to that
- 25 effect, but I do recall having given testimony. I

- 1 believe I've given testimony to that effect.
- 2 Q. Where did you give testimony to that effect?
- 3 A. Possibly in my Interrogatories in this case.
- 4 Q. Sir, you understand that there was a Group Legal
- 5 Conference in 1984 to help plan a joint strategy in
- 6 defense of the litigation that was then pending in
- 7 the United States?
- 8 A. I'm a little bit confused because I don't know
- 9 specifically whether that was a conference to discuss
- 10 that issue. You may be right. I -- I simply don't
- 11 know.
- 12 Q. Well you understand that in 19 -- I'm sorry.
- 13 You understand that in the early 1980s there was
- 14 a wave of new tobacco litigation in the United
- 15 States?
- 16 A. Yeah, I'm -- I'm not familiar with the time
- 17 frames on these things, but I have heard the
- 18 expression "there have been waves of litigation."
- 19 Q. And in fact, we saw a document in this
- 20 deposition that referred to the fresh spate of
- 21 litigation in the United States and was dated 1984;
- 22 right?
- 23 A. Indeed we did, yes.
- 24 Q. All right. And isn't it a fact that as a result
- 25 of that fresh spate of litigation in the United

- 1 States involving Brown & Williamson, that there was a
- 2 conference that was held that -- at which lawyers
- 3 from Brown & Williamson and B.A.T. Industries got
- 4 together and planned the joint defense or the defense
- 5 of Brown & Williamson in those cases?
- 6 MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 7 A. I'm -- in 1984?
- 8 Q. Yes, sir.
- 9 A. I -- I -- I simply don't know.
- 10 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 638 was marked
- for identification.)
- 12 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 13 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 14 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 638, this is a document Bates
- 15 numbered 109870737; right?
- 16 A. Correct.
- 17 Q. And this concerns a Group Legal Conference held
- 18 in 1984?
- 19 A. It bears the reference "GROUP LEGAL CONFERENCE
- 20 1984."
- 21 Q. It's on B.A.T. Industries stationery; right?
- 22 A. That appears to be the stationery of B.A.T.
- 23 Industries, yes.
- 24 Q. And it was sent out by a member of the board,
- 25 P. J. Ricketts?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Now, sir, it refers to a conference that was
- 3 held at Chelwood; right?
- 4 A. I'm going to ask you, please, to let me read
- 5 this letter --
- 6 Q. Fine.
- 7 A. -- before I answer any questions on it.
- 8 (Witness reviews Plaintiffs' Exhibit 638.)
- 9 MS. McGARRY: For the record, by letting
- 10 Mr. Wilson answer questions about this document,
- 11 B.A.T. Industries is not waiving any privilege it has
- 12 as to the substance of things actually discussed
- 13 during the conference, but I'll permit Mr. Wilson to
- 14 answer questions about what he knows.
- 15 THE WITNESS: Can I -- I would like to
- 16 consult with my counsel before I answer any questions
- 17 on this --
- MS. WIVELL: All right.
- 19 THE WITNESS: -- matter.
- MS. WIVELL: We'll go off the record.
- 21 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 22 (Recess taken.)
- 23 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 24 Q. The --
- 25 Sir, the conference was held at Chelwood, wasn't

- 1 it?
- 2 A. According to this letter, yes.
- 3 Q. Chelwood is a meeting facility that's owned by
- 4 B.A.T. Industries?
- 5 A. Chelwood was a meeting facility which was owned
- 6 by B.A.T. Industries.
- 7 Q. All right.
- 8 A. At that particular time I believe it -- on the
- 9 5th of -- on the -- in August 1985 I believe it was
- 10 owned by a company called B.A.T. Winds -- no, it
- 11 wouldn't. I -- correct that.
- 12 Yeah, I -- I -- to be honest, I don't know who
- 13 it was owned by at that particular time, 1984, but it
- 14 was certainly a -- a facility for meetings and
- 15 conferences, yes.
- 16 Q. And B.A.T. Industries used it for a lot of their
- 17 meetings and conferences, didn't they?
- 18 A. B.A.T. Industries -- I don't know what the
- 19 position was in 1984. At that time I can't -- I
- 20 can't really comment on it.
- 21 Q. All right. Now, sir, this document refers to
- 22 several objectives of the conference; right?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Now you understand that one of the purposes of
- 25 this conference was to discuss the litigation that

- 1 was ongoing in the United States against Brown &
- 2 Williamson?
- 3 A. I don't think the document actually says that.
- 4 Q. Well I asked if you understood that that was the
- 5 case.
- 6 A. No, I have no understanding about the
- 7 conference. I wasn't there. As I testified before,
- 8 I joined B.A.T. Industries in 1990, and I've never
- 9 spoken to anybody, as far as I know, that was at this
- 10 conference, so I -- I really don't know what was --
- 11 what was discussed there.
- 12 Q. And if a decision was made to -- at this
- 13 conference to -- strike that.
- 14 And if a decision was made at this conference
- 15 that documents would not be sent from, for example,
- 16 BATCO to Brown & Williamson anymore but to a lawyer
- 17 by the name of Maddox in Louisville, Kentucky, you're
- 18 just completely unfamiliar with that; is that right,
- 19 sir?
- 20 MS. McGARRY: Objection, assumes facts not
- 21 in evidence.
- 22 A. Forgive me for saying this, but I think you've
- 23 raised a sort of double hypothetical there, and I'm
- 24 really not sure how I can -- how I can answer it.
- 25 I've said before I wasn't at the meeting. I have no

- 1 idea of what took place beyond anything that's
- 2 specified in the letter.
- 3 Q. Mr. Wilson, I can assure you it wasn't
- 4 hypothetical at all. Now --
- 5 MS. McGARRY: I move to strike comments
- 6 counsel -- of counsel. They're irrelevant and they
- 7 in fact are incorrect.
- 8 Q. Now, sir, isn't it a fact that the board of
- 9 B.A.T. Industries P.L.C. has been informed in detail
- 10 about the American tobacco litigation?
- 11 A. We're talking now about the -- the current
- 12 litigation that's -- that's currently continuing?
- 13 Q. Yes, sir.
- 14 A. In my time as secretary of B.A.T. Industries,
- 15 the board has received regular reports from the
- 16 general counsel about the status of litigation to
- 17 which the company is a party, yes.
- 18 Q. And by "general counsel," to whom are you
- 19 referring?
- 20 A. I'm referring to the person who has the title
- 21 the solicitor, Stuart Chalfen.
- 22 Q. Well, sir, isn't it a fact that the board of
- 23 B.A.T. Industries has also heard from other American
- 24 lawyers briefing them on the details of the American
- 25 tobacco litigation?

- 1 A. Well I don't think that would be at all
- 2 surprising given that the -- B.A.T. Industries is
- 3 represented in this litigation by American counsel.
- 4 Q. But the fact is they have received briefings,
- 5 haven't they?
- 6 A. Yes, they have received at least one briefing.
- 7 Q. By a number of different American lawyers;
- 8 right?
- 9 A. A presentation has been made to the board by a
- 10 number of different American lawyers, yes.
- 11 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 639 was marked
- for identification.)
- 13 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 14 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as 639, this
- 15 is an outline of a presentation made to the B.A.T.
- 16 Industries board on July 25th, 1994; correct?
- 17 MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 18 A. It is headed "Presentation to B.A.T Industries
- 19 p.l.c. Board Members, July 25, 1994."
- 20 Q. And the Bates number of this document is
- 21 500022558.
- 22 A. That is correct.
- 23 Q. Sir, were you present for this presentation?
- 24 A. I certainly recollect being present at a
- 25 presentation at which these -- I believe some -- at

- 1 least some of these matters were addressed, and it
- 2 was possibly this meeting. I -- I simply can't
- 3 recall specifically, but I was certainly present at a
- 4 meeting at which the names -- some of the names of
- 5 the people here were -- were present, yes.
- 6 Q. Now I see that the last issue concerns
- 7 communications issues and responses; right?
- 8 A. That is the heading on the piece of paper, yes.
- 9 Q. And there is a name behind it. What does that
- 10 name mean?
- 11 A. You're referring to the word -- the word in
- 12 the -- in the box, in the brackets?
- 13 Q. Yes, sir.
- 14 A. That is the name of an individual employed in
- 15 B.A.T. Industries.
- 16 Q. All right. Who is that?
- 17 A. Michael Prideaux.
- 18 Q. And what is his role at B.A.T. Industries?
- 19 A. He is director of public affairs.
- 20 Q. He is not a lawyer; correct?
- 21 A. He is not a lawyer.
- 22 Q. All right. What subjects were discussed with
- 23 the board concerning communications and issues --
- 24 issues and responses by Mr. Prideaux at that
- 25 meeting?

- 1 MS. McGARRY: I'm going to caution the
- 2 witness just to answer exactly the question asked,
- 3 the -- the subjects, and before we go any further,
- 4 we'll have to determine whether we're getting into
- 5 privileged areas.
- 6 A. I -- this meeting is over three years ago. I
- 7 simply can't remember. I -- I simply cannot remember
- 8 what issues and responses -- what communications
- 9 issues and responses were discussed. I don't even
- 10 know if any communications issues and responses were
- 11 actually discussed. I mean, looking at this
- 12 document, it seems to me to some degree to be
- 13 potentially a draft, but I -- I simply can't -- I
- 14 can't tell you.
- I just don't have any specific recollection at
- 16 this time or even general recollection of what was
- 17 discussed in relation to, you know, that particular
- 18 matter.
- 19 Q. Well there are names behind other of the
- 20 presentations. Do you understand that Griffin Bell
- 21 made a presentation on the current political scene in
- 22 the U.S. to the board?
- 23 A. I remember that Judge Griffin Bell attended a
- 24 meeting at which I was present, and I think I've
- 25 previously said it could have been a meeting on the

- 1 25th of July. I don't know whether he made a
- 2 presentation on the current political scene in the
- 3 U.S. I don't even recall whether he actually made a
- 4 presentation at all, but I do recall him having been
- 5 there.
- 6 Q. You have no recollection about what he said?
- 7 MS. McGARRY: Asked and answered.
- 8 A. I think I've previously told you this meeting,
- 9 if it did take place on 25th of July 1994, was over
- 10 three years ago. I as part of my regular business
- 11 activities take part in numerous meetings. I can't
- 12 possibly remember the detail or -- and not
- 13 necessarily even the general thrust of every meeting
- 14 at which I've been -- I've been present. I simply
- 15 can't tell you.
- 16 Q. Do you remember a Mr. Prideaux making a
- 17 presentation to a board meeting on the subject of --
- 18 of litigation communications issues and responses?
- 19 A. Mr. Prideaux?
- 20 Q. Yes.
- 21 A. I don't have a specific recollection of whether
- 22 he did or didn't. I simply don't know.
- 23 Q. Now, sir, the B.A.T. Industries board was also
- 24 involved in the settlement talks that have gone on
- 25 this summer in the American tobacco litigation,

- 1 haven't they?
- 2 MS. McGARRY: I'm going to object. I think
- 3 it's improper to get anything relevant to the
- 4 settlement. It's certainly irrelevant to
- 5 jurisdiction and it's irrelevant to the litigation.
- 6 I don't think it's a proper area of inquiry, but I
- 7 will permit the witness to answer that question "yes"
- 8 or "no."
- 9 THE WITNESS: Could you read the question
- 10 back for me, please.
- MS. McGARRY: It said "Now, sir" --
- MS. WIVELL: Let me rephrase it.
- MS. McGARRY: Okay.
- 14 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 15 Q. Members of the B.A.T. board were involved in
- 16 settlement talks that have gone on this summer in the
- 17 American tobacco litigation?
- 18 A. Could you clarify "involved" for me, please.
- 19 Q. Participated in.
- 20 A. Well can I ask for further clarification. Talks
- 21 with whom?
- 22 Q. With people from the plaintiffs' side.
- 23 A. With representatives of the plaintiffs?
- 24 Q. Yes.
- 25 A. So the question is members of the board of

- 1 B.A.T. Industries took part in conversations with the
- 2 representatives of the plaintiffs in connection with
- 3 the settlement proposal; is that --
- 4 Q. Well that's a good question. Why don't you
- 5 answer that question.
- 6 A. I -- I don't know that that's the case.
- 7 Q. All right. But Martin Broughton did participate
- 8 in settlement discussions concerning the American
- 9 tobacco litigation which took place this summer;
- 10 right?
- 11 MS. McGARRY: I object. The question is
- 12 vague. You haven't specified with whom, and again
- 13 it's just improper.
- 14 A. I believe Martin Broughton took part in
- 15 discussions concerning the settlement, but precisely
- 16 with whom, I -- I believe he --
- 17 MS. McGARRY: I'm sorry, I should have
- 18 cautioned you just to answer that question "yes" or
- 19 "no."
- 20 MS. WIVELL: Well I object to your coaching
- 21 the witness and interrupting him.
- 22 Q. Sir, Martin Broughton came to the United States
- 23 to participate in discussions concerning the
- 24 settlement negotiations in the tobacco litigation
- 25 this summer, didn't he?

- 1 MS. McGARRY: That's "yes" or "no."
- 2 MS. WIVELL: Counsel, I really object to
- 3 your coaching this witness.
- 4 A. I believe he did.
- 5 Q. All right. And he came here and he took part in
- 6 discussions with other representatives from the
- 7 defendants in the American tobacco litigation, didn't
- 8 he?
- 9 MS. McGARRY: I'm going to instruct the
- 10 witness not to answer. The settlement is completely
- 11 irrelevant to the subject matter --
- MS. WIVELL: I'm going to --
- MS. McGARRY: -- of the deposition and it
- 14 is a totally improper area of inquiry.
- MS. WIVELL: I'm going to tie it up to --
- MS. McGARRY: It would certainly not be
- 17 admissible --
- MS. WIVELL: Excuse me, Counsel, quit
- 19 interrupting me.
- 20 MS. McGARRY: You interrupted me,
- 21 Ms. Wivell.
- MS. WIVELL: No, ma'am, I did not.
- 23 MS. McGARRY: I'm sure you're familiar with
- 24 the case law that says jurisdiction is determined at
- 25 the time the complaint is filed. You're asking about

- 1 events that may or may not have occurred over three
- 2 years later. Just on the grounds of timing, it's
- 3 completely irrelevant.
- 4 MS. WIVELL: And I'm going --
- 5 MS. McGARRY: We have a March 1994
- 6 discovery cutoff in this case. Talks about
- 7 settlement are completely inadmissible under
- 8 Minnesota law, as you know, and they are not a proper
- 9 subject of inquiry.
- 10 I'm directing the witness not to answer any more
- 11 of your questions on this subject.
- 12 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 13 Q. Sir, are you going to not answer my question?
- MS. McGARRY: Yeah, he's going to abide by
- 15 his counsel's instruction.
- MS. WIVELL: All right.
- 17 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that one of the conditions
- 18 of the American tobacco settlement was that Brown &
- 19 Williamson drop its lawsuit against Jeffrey Wigand?
- 20 MS. McGARRY: I direct the witness not to
- 21 answer.
- 22 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that in order to drop its
- 23 lawsuit against Jeffrey Wigand, Brown & Williamson
- 24 had to get approval from Martin Broughton?
- MS. McGARRY: I direct the witness not to

- 1 answer.
- MS. WIVELL: On what grounds, Counsel?
- 3 MS. McGARRY: The ones I previously
- 4 expressed.
- 5 MS. WIVELL: Oh, I haven't heard you
- 6 instruct him on privilege grounds. Is that right?
- 7 MS. McGARRY: I expressed my reasons I will
- 8 not permit the witness to answer any questions on
- 9 this. If you'd like to use up the remainder of your
- 10 time asking questions that you know he will be
- 11 instructed not to answer, you may do so.
- 12 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 13 Q. Sir, isn't it a fact that it's been reported in
- 14 the American press that Martin Broughton had to give
- 15 his permission before Brown & Williamson could drop
- 16 its suit against Jeffrey Wigand?
- MS. McGARRY: I repeat my instructions.
- 18 Q. Sir, did --
- MS. McGARRY: And further, what's reported
- 20 in the --
- MS. WIVELL: Excuse me, Counsel, could
- 22 you --
- MS. McGARRY: -- American press is
- 24 completely irrelevant. I hadn't finished my
- 25 objection, Martha.

- 1 MS. WIVELL: Oh, I'm sorry, Counsel. When
- 2 you stop and you breathe and you -- and I begin a
- 3 question and get halfway through it, I guess I -- I
- 4 assumed you were done.
- 5 MS. McGARRY: Well you made an erroneous
- 6 assumption. I think that what is reported in the
- 7 American press is irrelevant to whether or not the
- 8 court in -- court in Minnesota has jurisdiction --
- 9 MS. WIVELL: Fine, just say, "Objection."
- 10 MS. McGARRY: -- over B.A.T. Industries.
- 11 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 12 Q. Sir, did B.A.T. Industries ever sue Jeffrey
- 13 Wigand?
- 14 A. Not to my knowledge.
- 15 Q. Did BATCO ever sue Jeffrey Wigand?
- MS. McGARRY: This is irrelevant to
- 17 jurisdiction. It's beyond the scope. You clearly
- 18 finished everything that you think you can
- 19 legitimately ask about and now we're just --
- MS. WIVELL: Excuse me.
- 21 MS. McGARRY: -- wasting time, and I'm
- 22 directing the witness not to answer.
- MS. WIVELL: On -- on what grounds,
- 24 Counsel?
- MS. McGARRY: The ones I previously gave.

- 1 MS. WIVELL: Which are what? I just want
- 2 to make sure we have a complete record here.
- 3 MS. McGARRY: I can't quite understand,
- 4 Martha. If I give a long objection, you complain;
- 5 and if I give a short objection, you complain.
- 6 MS. WIVELL: I just want to make sure we
- 7 have a complete record.
- 8 MS. McGARRY: Okay. If I may go without
- 9 interruption, I'll tell you when I'm done.
- 10 As I stated previously, the case law is clear
- 11 that jurisdiction is determined at the time that a
- 12 complaint is filed. If you would like to ask
- 13 Mr. Wilson if he knows whether BATCO, who he is not
- 14 employed by, is not the subject of this deposition,
- 15 sued Mr. Wigand prior to March of 1994, you may ask
- 16 that question.
- 17 I think you are wasting all of our time here.
- 18 You're trying to go into the settlement. I said I
- 19 would tell you when I'm finished, Martha, so you
- 20 don't have any confusion this time.
- 21 If you're trying to get into the settlement,
- 22 that is also irrelevant. It is not admissible. It
- 23 is an improper subject of inquiry and is completely
- 24 unrelated to the subject matter of this deposition,
- 25 which is whether the court in Minnesota has personal

- 1 jurisdiction over B.A.T. Industries and had such
- 2 jurisdiction in March of 1994.
- 3 If you'd like to limit your question to whether
- 4 BATCO sued Jeffrey Wigand before March of 1994,
- 5 whether Mr. Wilson has personal knowledge of that, I
- 6 will permit the witness to answer that question.
- 7 MS. WIVELL: All right. For the record --
- 8 MS. McGARRY: I'm finished.
- 9 MS. WIVELL: Oh. For the record, my
- 10 questions are designed to show control over Brown &
- 11 Williamson. I believe that I can do that with
- 12 evidence that goes on today, Counsel. I haven't
- 13 heard you assert privilege. I believe that the only
- 14 way in this litigation that you can instruct a
- 15 witness not to answer, according to the court orders,
- 16 are on the basis of privilege.
- 17 I don't -- haven't heard a privilege objection
- 18 and I don't believe you're correct in instructing the
- 19 witness not to answer, and we will be reviewing the
- 20 transcript along with the -- and this, along with the
- 21 failure to provide a witness who is knowledgable on
- 22 subjects relating to jurisdiction on questions I've
- 23 asked, may or may not be brought to the attention of
- 24 the court. I believe the issue of whether Brown &
- 25 Williamson could drop a suit on its own as part of

- 1 the settlement goes to the issue of control, and
- 2 frankly that's the answer to the question I want, did
- 3 B.A.T. Industries have to approve Brown &
- 4 Williamson's dropping the suit against Jeffrey Wigand
- 5 as part of the settlement negotiations, "yes" or
- 6 "no."
- 7 That's the question I would like to have the
- 8 answer to and that's where I'm going to tie this all
- 9 together, so let me pose that question --
- 10 MS. McGARRY: You already posed it. I've
- 11 already instructed --
- 12 MS. WIVELL: I'll pose it again.
- 13 MS. McGARRY: -- the witness not to answer
- 14 it, and he's not --
- MS. WIVELL: Excuse me.
- MS. McGARRY: -- going to answer it this
- 17 time.
- 18 MS. WIVELL: Counsel, could you let me
- 19 finish. You just -- you've been -- every time I
- 20 start, you interrupt, so I would really appreciate
- 21 the opportunity to pose the question. Then you can
- 22 instruct him not to answer, and then we can move on.
- 23 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 24 Q. Sir, was it necessary for Brown & Williamson to
- 25 obtain the permission of anyone at B.A.T. Industries

- 1 before they could agree to drop their lawsuit against
- 2 Jeffrey Wigand as part of the settlement of the
- 3 American tobacco litigation that went on this
- 4 summer?
- 5 MS. McGARRY: I will permit you to answer
- 6 "yes" or "no" whether it was necessary.
- 7 A. I believe it was not necessary.
- 8 Q. Was the permission of B.A.T. Industries obtained
- 9 by Brown & Williamson before it agreed to drop its
- 10 lawsuit against Jeffrey Wigand as one of the
- 11 conditions of the American tobacco settlement that
- 12 occurred this summer?
- MS. McGARRY: I instruct the witness not to
- 14 answer.
- MS. WIVELL: So the very fact of -- you're
- 16 instructing him not to answer on the very fact of
- 17 whether the -- the permission was obtained?
- MS. McGARRY: That's correct.
- 19 MS. WIVELL: On what grounds, Counsel?
- 20 MS. McGARRY: The ones I already outlined.
- 21 We're not going into the settlement, Martha. You
- 22 said you had one question, whether it was necessary.
- 23 I permitted him to answer that. Now you're going
- 24 further.
- MS. WIVELL: That's right.

- 1 MS. McGARRY: I shouldn't have even asked
- 2 him -- let him answer that. We're not going into the
- 3 settlement. Any question related to the settlement
- 4 whatsoever the witness will be instructed not to
- 5 answer.
- 6 MS. WIVELL: All right. Then let me phrase
- 7 this question.
- 8 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 9 Q. Did anyone from Brown -- representing Brown &
- 10 Williamson obtain Martin Broughton's permission to
- 11 drop the lawsuit against Jeffrey Wigand --
- MS. McGARRY: Instruct the witness not
- 13 to --
- 14 Q. -- before --
- MS. WIVELL: Excuse me. May I finish,
- 16 Counsel.
- MS. McGARRY: I didn't realize you weren't
- 18 finished.
- 19 Q. Did anyone representing Brown & Williamson
- 20 obtain Martin Broughton's permission to drop the
- 21 lawsuit against Jeffrey Wigand before it agreed to do
- 22 so as part of the conditions of the American tobacco
- 23 settlement this summer?
- MS. McGARRY: I instruct the witness not to
- 25 answer.

- 1 MS. WIVELL: All right. Would you please
- 2 state the grounds. I just want to make sure that we
- 3 have them clearly in the record.
- 4 MS. McGARRY: The same grounds I stated the
- 5 last four times you asked the question.
- 6 MS. WIVELL: And you are not instructing
- 7 him to answer on the grounds of privilege?
- 8 MS. McGARRY: I explained what my position
- 9 was.
- 10 MS. WIVELL: So you are not; correct,
- 11 Counsel?
- MS. McGARRY: I'm not the witness,
- 13 Ms. Wivell.
- MS. WIVELL: I'm sorry, now you refuse to
- 15 tell me.
- MS. McGARRY: I'm not wasting time. We've
- 17 gone over it and over it. The first three times you
- 18 asked the question, I explained the reasons why I
- 19 instructed the witness not to answer.
- 20 MS. WIVELL: I just want to make the record
- 21 clear.
- MS. McGARRY: We must be getting near the
- 23 end here since we're getting into totally irrelevant
- 24 matters.
- 25 BY MS. WIVELL:

- 1 Q. Now, sir, in 1990 B.A.T. Industries changed the
- 2 reporting relationship between it and Brown &
- 3 Williamson; right?
- 4 A. In 1990?
- 5 Q. Yes, sir.
- 6 A. I -- no, I think that's incorrect.
- 7 Q. Well isn't it a fact that as of the 1st of April
- 8 1990, B.A.T. Industries announced that the management
- 9 of Brown & Williamson would report directly to B.A.T.
- 10 Industries?
- 11 A. Oh, I see. You're -- yes, thank you for --
- 12 you've -- you've corrected my recollection. I
- 13 assumed you were talking about the interposition of
- 14 BATUS Holdings as the new holding company of Brown &
- 15 Williamson in the '70s.
- 16 Q. Well just so the record's clear, there was a
- 17 period of time when Brown & Williamson reported
- 18 through BATUS to B.A.T. Industries; correct?
- 19 A. Yes, there was.
- 20 Q. And then in 1990 B.A.T. Industries removed BATUS
- 21 as part of the reporting line; right?
- 22 A. I don't know that --
- 23 MS. McGARRY: Objection, assumes facts not
- 24 in evidence. You may answer.
- 25 A. I don't know that it actually removed BATUS as

- 1 part of the reporting line as such.
- 2 Q. Well you would agree that as of April 1st, 1990,
- 3 B.A.T. Industries determined that the management of
- 4 Brown & Williamson would report directly to it?
- 5 MS. McGARRY: Objection to the form.
- 6 A. I'm sorry. Can you -- can you repeat the
- 7 question, please.
- 8 Q. Certainly. You would agree that as of
- 9 April 1st, 1990, B.A.T. Industries determined that
- 10 the management of Brown & Williams -- Brown &
- 11 Williamson would report directly to B.A.T.
- 12 Industries?
- 13 A. I would I think accept that from 1990 the chief
- 14 executive officer of Brown & Williamson would
- 15 henceforth report directly to B.A.T. Industries.
- MS. WIVELL: Mr. LaBorde, could you show
- 17 the witness Exhibit 287.
- 18 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 287 was handed
- to the witness.)
- 20 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 21 Q. Sir, showing you what's previously been marked
- 22 as Exhibit 287, this is a document Bates numbered
- 23 400364232 as its beginning Bates number; right?
- 24 A. Yes, it is, yes.
- 25 Q. This is a press release from B.A.T. Industries

- 1 dated January 24th, 1990?
- 2 A. It appears to be, yes.
- 3 Q. And it concerns the -- in part the change of
- 4 reporting relationship between B.A.T. Industries and
- 5 Brown & Williamson?
- 6 A. I think it would be helpful if I could just have
- 7 a minute to -- quickly to read this --
- 8 Q. That's fine.
- 9 A. -- this document. Thank you.
- 10 (Witness reviews Plaintiffs' Exhibit 287.)
- MS. WIVELL: Can we go off the record for a
- 12 second.
- THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 14 (Discussion off the record.)
- 15 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 16 Q. Sir, you've now reviewed 287.
- 17 A. Yes, I have.
- 18 Q. This press release announces that effective
- 19 April 1st, 1990 the management of Brown & Williamson
- 20 would report directly to B.A.T. Industries?
- 21 A. This says that "... the managements of Brown &
- 22 Williamson Tobacco and B.A.T Cigarettenfabriken GmbH
- 23 (BATCF) will report directly to B.A.T
- 24 Industries"
- 25 And I'm going to take the opportunity at this

- 1 stage to explain the rationale and purpose behind
- 2 this, which is as follows: In 1989 B.A.T. Industries
- 3 P.L.C. received -- or the shareholders of B.A.T.
- 4 Industries P.L.C., its public stockholders, received
- 5 an offer from the board of a company called Hoylake
- 6 Investments to sell their shares to Hoylake. In
- 7 other words, it was a takeover offer for the
- 8 company. The takeover offer lasted some, I think, 10
- 9 or 11 months. It went on from about July 1989 and
- 10 the offer wasn't finally abandoned until about the
- 11 middle of 1990, and this statement was put out during
- 12 the course of the takeover period.
- 13 As part of the company's defense to the
- 14 takeover, the board proposed and the shareholders --
- 15 the public stockholders of the board approved various
- 16 strategic changes in the composition and the
- 17 business -- businesses of the subsidiaries which the
- 18 company owned, and essentially what was agreed was
- 19 that the company should henceforth concentrate its
- 20 activities on tobacco -- or the company's business,
- 21 the business lines in which the company invested,
- 22 should be restricted to essentially tobacco and
- 23 financial services and that the group, which at that
- 24 time was also heavily engaged in retail activities,
- 25 paper activities and I think some other activities,

- 1 would divest itself of those investments.
- 2 And in the United States -- and I think I may
- 3 have mentioned this earlier -- the parent company of
- 4 Brown & Williamson was a company called BATUS, BATUS
- 5 Holdings, and BATUS had a number of subsidiaries, one
- 6 of which was Brown & Williamson and others of which
- 7 were Appleton Papers; Saks, Saks Fifth Avenue I think
- 8 it's well known as here; Marshall Field's; and I
- 9 think some others as well. And as part of the
- 10 strategy for divestment, which I've previously
- 11 mentioned, BATUS was going to divest itself of those
- 12 other interests, which resulted in the only operating
- 13 company BATUS owning being Brown & Williamson.
- 14 And that I think is the justification -- or the
- 15 rationale for why -- since BATUS had no other
- 16 companies which were carrying on operations, why it
- 17 no longer made sense for B&W to continue to report or
- 18 the chief executive of B&W to continue to report to
- 19 B.A.T. Industries through the intermediate holding
- 20 company BATUS.
- 21 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive.
- 22 Sir, my question was simply this press release
- 23 announces that effective April 1st, 1990 the
- 24 management of Brown & Williamson would report
- 25 directly to B.A.T. Industries; right?

- 1 A. I think that's the first part of the answer I
- 2 previously gave.
- 3 Q. Now, sir, even before Brown & Williamson
- 4 reported directly to the B.A.T. board, members of the
- 5 B.A.T. board were involved in and interactive with
- 6 Brown & Williamson; correct?
- 7 MS. McGARRY: Objection, vague. You may
- 8 answer.
- 9 A. I -- I -- I don't understand the question. I'm
- 10 sorry, could you -- could you clarify.
- 11 Q. All right. Well, for example, even before 1990
- 12 Brown & Williamson was required to -- to provide
- 13 monthly reports to B.A.T. Industries; isn't that
- 14 true?
- 15 A. I do not know whether it was required to produce
- 16 monthly reports or not required. I -- I simply don't
- 17 know. I -- I make the point again that I wasn't
- 18 actually employed in B.A.T. Industries before October
- 19 of 1990, so I have no personal knowledge of this.
- 20 Q. Well, sir, you understand you're here today as
- 21 the spokesperson for B.A.T. Industries; right?
- 22 MS. McGARRY: Objection, asked and answered
- 23 four or five times. You may answer it again.
- 24 A. I understand what you've just said to me.
- 25 Q. All right. Sir, isn't it a fact that Brown &

- 1 Williamson was required to provide management reports
- 2 even before 1990 to B.A.T. Industries?
- 3 MS. McGARRY: Objection. The witness
- 4 already stated he doesn't know.
- 5 A. I do not know whether they were required or not
- 6 required, whether they provided management reports or
- 7 didn't provide management reports.
- 8 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 640 was marked
- 9 for identification.)
- 10 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 11 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 12 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 640, this is a document Bates
- 13 numbered 674107764; correct?
- 14 A. I'm -- I'm sorry, I'm -- I can't -- oh, sorry,
- 15 could you just read the -- the number back to me,
- 16 please.
- 17 Q. Certainly. 674107764.
- 18 A. Yes, it bears that Bates number.
- 19 MS. McGARRY: Can I ask whether this is on
- 20 the predesignation list? It doesn't --
- MR. LEWIS: It is.
- 22 MS. McGARRY: Okay. Thanks. It just
- 23 didn't look familiar. Thank you.
- 24 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 25 Q. Now, sir, this is a management report from

- 1 Brown & Williamson for the month of March 1985;
- 2 correct?
- 3 A. The -- the -- the document states "Dear Gerald:
- 4 Enclosed is a Management Report for the month of
- 5 March 1985."
- 6 Q. And it provides various different kinds of
- 7 information from Brown & Williamson to B&W -- or I'm
- 8 sorry, strike that.
- 9 And this document provides different kinds of
- 10 information from Brown & Williamson to -- directly to
- 11 B.A.T. Industries, doesn't it, sir?
- 12 A. It -- it states "Information is provided as
- 13 follows" and then specifies some information, and the
- 14 document is addressed to Mr. Gerald -- Gerald Dennis
- 15 at B.A.T. Industries.
- 16 Q. Now, sir, monthly reports like this were made by
- 17 Brown & Williamson directly to -- strike that.
- 18 Brown & Williamson was required to make monthly
- 19 reports like this one directly to B.A.T. Industries,
- 20 wasn't it, sir?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, asked and
- 22 answered.
- 23 A. I have no knowledge whether Brown & Williamson
- 24 was required to make reports, whether it voluntarily
- 25 produced these reports for its own reasons, or I

- 1 simply don't know the answer to this.
- 2 MS. WIVELL: Because this matter concerns
- 3 the control of Brown & Williamson and -- and would be
- 4 a subject of the jurisdiction deposition, I would
- 5 request that I have a witness who is knowledgable $\,$
- 6 about this subject so that I can ask questions of
- 7 that witness at this deposition and who can answer
- 8 them. Are you going to provide me such a witness,
- 9 Counsel?
- 10 MS. McGARRY: I'll consider whether we'll
- 11 try to get the answer to this question for you.
- MS. WIVELL: When will I know since we're
- 13 now some six or more hours into this deposition?
- MS. McGARRY: Today.
- 15 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 16 Q. Sir, can you answer any questions for me about
- 17 the amount of control that B.A.T. Industries
- 18 exercised over Brown & Williamson in the period
- 19 before 1990?
- 20 MS. McGARRY: Object that it assumes facts
- 21 not in evidence, but I'll permit the witness to
- 22 answer the question.
- 23 A. That really must depend on the questions you ask
- 24 me. I -- I simply don't know.
- 25 Q. Do you have any information as you sit here

- 1 today on the amount of control that B.A.T. Industries
- 2 exercised over Brown & Williamson prior to 1990?
- 3 MS. McGARRY: Same objection.
- 4 A. I'm not really sure what you mean by "control."
- 5 Q. Well, for example, things that B.A.T. Industries
- 6 required Brown & Williamson to do.
- 7 A. I don't know what B.A.T. Industries required
- 8 Brown & Williamson to do and what Brown & Williamson
- 9 did for themselves. It doesn't follow incidentally
- 10 from this document, which is a copy of a monthly
- 11 report, a monthly -- a management report, I should
- 12 say, for the month of March 1985, that Brown &
- 13 Williamson was either in the habit or was instructed
- 14 or was required to produce management reports to
- 15 B.A.T. Industries. It's possible that Mr. Gerald
- 16 Dennis at B.A.T. Industries was interested in having
- 17 a snapshot of what the position was in the United
- 18 States at that time and, I mean, this document was
- 19 produced in response, but beyond that I -- I can't
- 20 say.
- 21 Q. You can't tell me whether monthly reports were
- 22 required to be sent to B.A.T. Industries, can you?
- 23 A. I can tell you neither whether monthly reports
- 24 were required to be sent or whether they were sent by
- 25 Brown & Williamson of their own volition. I simply

- 1 do not know.
- 2 Q. Would it be fair to say that you do not know the
- 3 kinds of matters that might have been required by
- 4 B.A.T. Industries concerning the day-to-day
- 5 management of the company before 19 -- of Brown &
- 6 Williamson before 1990?
- 7 MS. McGARRY: Object to the form of the
- 8 question.
- 9 A. I have previously testified that the group --
- 10 that B.A.T. Industries confers on the companies in
- 11 the group which carry out business activities a
- 12 considerable degree of autonomy -- that has always
- 13 been the case, to my knowledge, since 1976 -- and
- 14 that in accordance with the terms of the delegated
- 15 authority certain matters have to be referred to
- 16 either the Chief Executive's Committee, previously
- 17 Chairman's Policy Committee, or to the board of
- 18 B.A.T. Industries, depending on the significance in
- 19 terms of financial amounts involved.
- 20 The general approach of B.A.T. Industries has to
- 21 con -- has been to confer considerable autonomy on
- 22 the activities of its operating companies, and this
- 23 reflects the fact that B.A.T. Industries has never at
- 24 any time employed more than 185 people, who cannot
- 25 possibly be -- have been expected -- could not

- 1 possibly either have been expected or in reality have
- 2 performed management functions and carried out
- 3 management tasks on behalf of a collection of
- 4 subsidiaries with a wide geographical spread
- 5 numbering several hundreds and employing between them
- 6 something in the region of at one particular point in
- 7 time 270,000 people.
- 8 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive. Sir, my --
- 9 MS. McGARRY: That was very responsive.
- 10 You just didn't like it.
- MS. WIVELL: No, it was nonresponsive.
- 12 Q. Sir, do you know the facts of whether or not
- 13 B.A.T. Industries board members, for example, were
- 14 involved in the management of any day-to-day issues
- 15 with Brown & Williamson?
- MS. McGARRY: Object to the question as
- 17 vague, but you may answer.
- 18 A. Could you clarify, please, for me, the -- the
- 19 meaning of the words "day-to-day."
- 20 Q. Well, for example, isn't it a fact that Patrick
- 21 Sheehy visited Brown & Williamson in 1979 and
- 22 discussed details of Kool advertising with the
- 23 management of Brown & Williamson and that he did so
- 24 in his capacity as a board member of B.A.T.
- 25 Industries?

- 1 MS. McGARRY: Objection, assumes facts not
- 2 in evidence.
- 3 A. I have absolutely no knowledge of that.
- 4 Q. And that's my point. As you sit here today, you
- 5 don't really have any knowledge, sir, do you, of the
- 6 interactions between B.A.T. Industries and Brown &
- 7 Williamson on issues related to management, do you?
- 8 MS. McGARRY: I object to the questioner
- 9 raising her voice and being argumentative.
- MS. WIVELL: The questioner --
- MS. McGARRY: I object --
- MS. WIVELL: -- has not raised her voice.
- 13 That time --
- MS. McGARRY: May I finish?
- MS. WIVELL: -- I did because I was
- 16 interrupted again.
- MS. McGARRY: May I finish? Was your
- 18 question finished, or did you have more? I thought
- 19 you said "do you" at the end.
- 20 MS. WIVELL: Well I'll rephrase. I'll
- 21 repeat the question.
- MS. McGARRY: No, I'm going to object. I
- 23 think that you have mischaracterized the witness's
- 24 previous testimony. He has clearly stated he's aware
- 25 of many of these issues, and he previously testified

- 1 that Sir Patrick Sheehy was the head of BATCO in
- 2 1979.
- 3 MS. WIVELL: Well let's take care of that
- 4 little detail.
- 5 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 6 Q. In 1979 Patrick Sheehy was on the board of
- 7 B.A.T. Industries, wasn't he, sir?
- 8 A. In 1979?
- 9 Q. Yes, sir.
- 10 A. Yes, he was, yeah.
- 11 Q. Yeah. And isn't it fair to say that you really
- 12 don't know the kinds of matters that might have been
- 13 required by B.A.T. Industries concerning the
- 14 day-to-day management of Brown & Williamson before
- 15 1990?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, mischaracterizes
- 17 the witness's prior testimony. You may answer.
- 18 A. I -- I'm not sure how I can respond in any way
- 19 that's different from what I've previously said.
- 20 You're asking the same question over and over again,
- 21 and I have given you and answered to the best of my
- 22 ability, and I cannot add anything more.
- 23 Save that, the number of facts, as you've called
- 24 them, which are relevant to the operation of any
- 25 company on any particular day in any particular year

- 1 must be thousands and thousands, and if
- 2 it's possible for one human being to be aware of
- 3 every single fact that ever affected any
- 4 organization, I'd be very surprised to meet such a
- 5 person.
- 6 Q. Move to strike as nonresponsive.
- 7 Sir, are you aware of the kinds of matters that
- 8 were required by B.A.T. Industries concerning the
- 9 day-to-day management of Brown & Williamson before
- 10 1990?
- 11 MS. McGARRY: Objection, contrary to the
- 12 witness's prior testimony.
- 13 A. I -- I've given you an answer to this. I do not
- 14 know what more I can add to what I have previously
- 15 said.
- 16 Q. You don't know any of the facts, sir, do you?
- 17 A. I think --
- 18 Q. If I --
- MS. McGARRY: That's a complete question?
- MS. WIVELL: Yeah, that's a complete
- 21 question.
- 22 MS. McGARRY: The question is does he know
- 23 any of the facts?
- MS. WIVELL: I'll withdraw the question.
- MS. McGARRY: Okay.

- 1 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 2 Q. Sir, I could sit here and ask you questions
- 3 about the interaction between B.A.T. Industries and
- 4 Brown & Williamson before 1990, and you don't know
- 5 those facts so you can't answer those questions; --
- 6 MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 7 Q. -- isn't that true?
- 8 MS. McGARRY: Objection, calls for the
- 9 witness to speculate and is contrary to the prior
- 10 testimony of the witness.
- 11 A. It must depend on what facts you ask me.
- 12 Q. All right. Well are you aware of a meeting that
- 13 took place in 1979 between employees of Brown &
- 14 Williamson and Sir Patrick Sheehy at which time
- 15 details concerning Kool strategy for that brand were
- 16 discussed?
- 17 A. I'm not aware of that meeting.
- 18 Q. Are you even aware that Sir Patrick Sheehy went
- 19 to Brown & Williamson in 1979?
- 20 A. I think I've previously mentioned to you that I
- 21 didn't join B.A.T. Industries until 1990, and I'm not
- 22 aware that Sir Patrick Sheehy went to Brown &
- 23 Williamson in 1979.
- 24 Q. So --
- 25 A. That does not, however -- if I may finish my

- 1 answer -- does not, however, prove one way or the
- 2 other that I do or do not know facts about B.A.T.
- 3 Industries prior to 1990.
- 4 Q. Well, sir, let's take a look at this exhibit,
- 5 see if you know anything about this one.
- 6 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 641 was marked
- 7 for identification.)
- 8 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 9 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 10 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 641, this is a document that
- 11 bears the Bates number 660067096; right?
- 12 A. That looks right, yes.
- 13 Q. And it's a memorandum from F. E. McKeown to
- 14 Willets and Reid regarding Kool brand mapping;
- 15 right?
- 16 A. It is from the person you said to the persons
- 17 you've said and it is headed "SUBJECT: KOOL Brand
- 18 Mapping."
- 19 Q. Now the first sentence says "Mr. Sheehy will
- 20 be ... to see us at some time during September";
- 21 right?
- 22 A. It says "Mr. Sheehy will be in to see us at some
- 23 time during September."
- 24 Q. Did that meeting take place?
- 25 A. I do not know.

- 1 Q. It goes on to say "Management has requested that
- 2 we be prepared to discuss with them on a style by
- 3 style basis the positioning, brand character and
- 4 mapping of our assigned brands as well as key
- 5 selected competitors"; right?
- 6 A. It says "Management has requested that we be
- 7 prepared to discuss with them on a style by style
- 8 basis the positioning, brand character and mapping of
- 9 our assigned brands as well as key selected
- 10 competitors." Now by looking at the document itself,
- 11 which appears to be a production from Brown &
- 12 Williamson, I think -- I'm assuming that Mr. McKeown
- 13 and Messrs. Willets and Reid are employees of Brown &
- 14 Williamson, and I see that what is being said is that
- 15 management -- and it seems to me perfectly reasonable
- 16 in this context to say that management is the
- 17 management of Brown & Williamson, by whom I assume
- 18 those three individuals were employed -- that
- 19 management of Brown & Williamson is requesting that
- 20 they be prepared to discuss with management on a
- 21 style-by-style basis the positioning, brand character
- 22 and mapping of our assigned brands.
- 23 Q. Now, sir, did that meeting take -- I'm sorry,
- 24 strike that.
- 25 Did that discussion take place?

- 1 A. You're asking me to confirm whether a discussion
- 2 took place between certain employees of Brown &
- 3 Williamson and the management of Brown & Williamson.
- 4 Q. No, sir, actually I'm asking B.A.T. Industries
- 5 whether a member of its board took part in those
- 6 discussions. That's what I'm asking.
- 7 A. Well thank you for clarifying because that's not
- 8 the --
- 9 MS. McGARRY: Had you finished your prior
- 10 answer? I think she cut you off before.
- 11 THE WITNESS: I'm -- it doesn't -- it
- 12 doesn't matter.
- 13 A. But I'm grateful for the clarification you've
- 14 given because I don't think that's in fact what you
- 15 asked before, and if that's what you intended, well,
- 16 thank you for clarifying it.
- 17 You're asking if Mr. Sheehy came in to see those
- 18 people during September 1979. I -- I do not know.
- 19 Q. All right. And did those discussions take
- 20 place, sir?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, asked and
- 22 answered. What are we, ten times now?
- 23 A. I can't add anything to the answer I gave I
- 24 think two questions ago on that subject.
- 25 Q. Now, sir, are --

- 1 Are you aware of the role that Sir Patrick
- 2 Sheehy when he was chair of the board of B.A.T.
- 3 Industries played in public communications that
- 4 Brown & Williamson put out?
- 5 MS. McGARRY: Objection, assumes facts not
- 6 in evidence. You may answer.
- 7 A. I'm not aware of any particular role that
- 8 Mr. Sheehy took part in in connection with Brown &
- 9 Williamson publications while he was the chairman of
- 10 B.A.T. Industries P.L.C.
- 11 Q. So there's no way that you can answer my
- 12 questions about that subject; right, sir?
- MS. McGARRY: That mischaracterizes the
- 14 witness's testimony.
- 15 A. Could you read back the question to me, please.
- 16 Q. Well let me rephrase it.
- 17 If I were to ask you questions about
- 18 Mr. Sheehy's involvement in approving or disapproving
- 19 communications that were made to the public by
- 20 Brown & Williamson, do you know anything about that?
- MS. McGARRY: You're representing there was
- 22 such involvement; is that right? You're not saying
- 23 did Mr. Sheehy have this involvement. You're
- 24 representing there was involvement and you're asking
- 25 the witness whether he knows about what you're

- 1 representing as a fact; is that it? I think the
- 2 question's unclear.
- 3 MS. WIVELL: Then object.
- 4 MS. McGARRY: I object.
- 5 A. Could you clarify the question for me, please.
- 6 Q. Sir, did Mr. Sheehy have involvement in
- 7 approving public statements made by Brown &
- 8 Williamson?
- 9 A. I'm not aware of any specific instance.
- 10 Q. You --
- 11 A. He may have done; he may not have done. I
- 12 don't -- I simply don't know. I'm not aware that he
- 13 did.
- 14 Q. You just don't know one way or the other;
- 15 right?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, mischaracterizes
- 17 the witness's testimony.
- 18 A. I think in these matters, if you're going to ask
- 19 me, to take a particular line with me, I think it
- 20 would be quite fair to me to actually present me with
- 21 facts and then see whether I know the facts or I
- 22 don't know the facts. You're asking me to speculate
- 23 an awful lot about things that I'm -- I'm -- I
- 24 really -- I can't be more helpful than I'm trying to
- 25 be. If you want to present particular facts to me,

- 1 I'm very happy to do the best I can to tell you what
- 2 I do and do not know.
- 3 Q. Sir, Mr. Sheehy had involvement in approving
- 4 public statements made by Brown & Williamson, didn't
- 5 he?
- 6 MS. McGARRY: Objection, assumes facts not
- 7 in evidence.
- 8 A. I -- I do not know.
- 9 Q. And if I handed you a document, you wouldn't
- 10 know anything more than was on the face of that
- 11 document, would you, sir, about --
- MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 13 Q. -- that subject?
- 14 MS. McGARRY: Objection, calls for
- 15 speculation. Why don't you hand him the document.
- 16 A. It's not only speculation. It's also a
- 17 mischaracterization. I mean, I was -- I have been
- 18 the company secretary of B.A.T. Industries since
- 19 1993, and for at least two or nearly three years of
- 20 my tenure -- two years of my tenure as secretary, Sir
- 21 Patrick Sheehy was the chairman of the board of
- 22 B.A.T. Industries.
- Now you did raise a question in respect of Sir
- 24 Patrick Sheehy's chairmanship of the board of B.A.T.
- 25 Industries, so it is just possible that if you

- 1 produce documents or you make -- or you propose facts
- 2 to me, that I may have some knowledge of them.
- 3 MS. WIVELL: Well I would like B.A.T.
- 4 Industries to produce a witness immediately who is
- 5 knowledgable on whether or not Mr. Sheehy approved
- 6 public statements that were issued by Brown &
- 7 Williamson so that I don't have to waste my time with
- 8 this witness.
- 9 Q. Now, sir, you are aware that from --
- 10 MS. McGARRY: We're going to take a break
- 11 now. I don't think the witness wants to take any
- 12 more abuse at this particular time.
- MS. WIVELL: I haven't been abusive to the
- 14 witness at all, and I just want the record to reflect
- 15 it's counsel who wants to take the break and not the
- 16 witness.
- 17 THE WITNESS: Well perhaps --
- MS. WIVELL: We can go off the record.
- 19 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 20 (Recess taken.)
- 21 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 22 Q. Sir, are you aware of a meeting that took place
- 23 between representatives of Brown & Williamson and
- 24 members of the board of B.A.T. Industries at the
- 25 Chelwood Conference Centre?

- 1 A. Could you please tell me -- give me a date or
- 2 something.
- 3 Q. In 1991.
- 4 A. I'm not specifically aware of any meeting, no.
- 5 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 642 was marked
- for identification.)
- 7 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 8 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 9 Exhibit 642, this is a document that begins with
- 10 Bates number 583223073; right?
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 Q. And this is a memo from Rufus Honeycutt to S. L.
- 13 Raymond; right?
- 14 A. Yeah, it's -- well it's certainly a memo from
- 15 someone with the initials R. H. Honeycutt to S. L.
- 16 Raymond, yes.
- 17 Q. All right. Mr. Honeycutt's a Brown & Williamson
- 18 employee, isn't he, sir?
- 19 A. Well I -- I -- I don't know whether he is or
- 20 isn't, but I must assume that since he's written
- 21 on -- well no, I just don't know. I mean, his -- his
- 22 name is on the bottom of the document and the
- 23 document is headed "BROWN & WILLIAMSON TOBACCO
- 24 CORPORATION, " but I -- I don't know.
- 25 Q. Do you know who S. L. Raymond is?

- 1 A. I do not know who S. L. Raymond is, no.
- 2 Q. There is a reference at the beginning of the
- 3 third paragraph that says "Another valuable aspect of
- 4 MDP number 79 was the chance to meet and hear members
- 5 of the Board of BAT Industries"; right?
- 6 A. "... a chance to meet and hear members of the
- 7 board of BAT Industries, "yes, it does say that.
- 8 Q. All right. And if --
- 9 In the second paragraph it refers to a -- a
- 10 meeting that took place at Chelwood; right?
- 11 A. I'm sorry, in which paragraph?
- 12 Q. The second paragraph, sir.
- 13 A. Yes, it does, yes.
- 14 Q. Do you know what happened at the meeting that's
- 15 referred to in this document?
- 16 A. I'm going to have to ask you, please, to let me
- 17 read the -- read the -- read the document.
- 18 Q. Well --
- MS. McGARRY: Sure.
- 20 Q. -- before you read the document, can you just
- 21 answer my question. My question is: Sir, do you
- 22 know without reading the document what happened at
- 23 the meeting referred to in this document?
- 24 A. I do not -- not know what happened at the
- 25 meeting referred to in this document, but I do know

- 1 what the expression "MDP" means and I do understand
- 2 the reference "MDP" to mean "management -- management
- 3 development program," and Chelwood, as we have
- 4 previously established, was a management
- 5 development -- it was a center where meetings took
- 6 place and it was in fact the center where primarily
- 7 junior managers, those occupying junior management
- 8 positions, in the group came together from all
- 9 different countries and different companies and
- 10 learned new skills, new management skills, to develop
- 11 their careers and to enable them to progress into
- 12 senior management positions. And similar courses
- 13 were also provided for middle managers and have in
- 14 the past also been provided for the very senior level
- 15 of managers.
- 16 And that is my understanding of the expression
- 17 "MDP," and the reference to 79 would be MDP, the
- 18 79th MDP course.
- 19 Q. You understand that the MDPs were sponsored by
- 20 B.A.T. Industries; right?
- 21 A. I understand that the MDPs were sponsored by the
- 22 operating companies and were facilitated -- certainly
- 23 the one I went on was facilitated by B.A.T.
- 24 Industries and that what happens, I think I have
- 25 previously testified, was that the operating

- 1 companies would send their, if I may use the
- 2 expression, high fliers or potential high fliers to
- 3 Chelwood to improve their management skills.
- 4 Q. It would be fair to say that -- well I'm sorry,
- 5 strike that.
- 6 Did you attend MDP 79?
- 7 A. I did not attend MDP 79. Well I -- I don't
- 8 think I attended MDP 79. I can't be absolutely
- 9 certain. As I say, I did attend an MDP course, but
- 10 I -- I can't be certain exactly when it was. It
- 11 would have been obviously after October 1990, when I
- 12 joined B.A.T. Industries, but I believe it was later
- 13 than May 31 -- certainly later than May 31, 1991.
- 14 Q. Would it be fair to say that if I were to ask
- 15 you questions right now without you reading this
- 16 document about what happened at MDP 79, you could not
- 17 answer them?
- 18 A. I think --
- 19 MS. McGARRY: Beyond what he's already
- 20 described.
- 21 A. Yes, beyond what I've already described,
- 22 that's -- that's fair, yes.
- 23 Q. All right. Sir, Sir Patrick Sheehy while he was
- 24 chair of B.A.T. Industries participated in the debate
- 25 on smoking-and-health issues, didn't he?

- 1 A. Could -- could you -- are you -- could you
- 2 clarify for me whether you're talking about a
- 3 specific debate or whether you're asking whether Sir
- 4 Patrick Sheehy discussed the issues of smoking and
- 5 health or was involved in issues of smoking and
- 6 health or -- because I -- I don't understand the --
- 7 the question's just too vague for me.
- 8 Q. All right. Well, isn't it true that Sir Patrick
- 9 Sheehy while he was chairman of B.A.T. Industries was
- 10 actively involved in putting forth the company's
- 11 position that there was no causation between
- 12 cigarette smoking and disease?
- 13 A. When we were here together yesterday, we looked
- 14 at a document dated 1984, I think entitled "Legal
- 15 Considerations on Smoking and Health Policy," and we
- 16 determined that this was a policy statement by the
- 17 board of B.A.T. Industries. And in 1984, as I've
- 18 previously testified, Sir Patrick Sheehy was the
- 19 chairman of B.A.T. Industries.
- Now since this was a policy statement by the
- 21 board of B.A.T. Industries, it is, I think, logical
- 22 that Sir Patrick Sheehy would have been involved in
- 23 that policy statement, and I think the policy
- 24 statement speaks for itself as to what the policy of
- 25 the group was and what the view -- view of the group

- 1 was as regards the issue of causation.
- 2 Q. Putting aside the policy statement for a moment,
- 3 sir, isn't it also true that Sir Patrick Sheehy while
- 4 he was chair of B.A.T. Industries was actively
- 5 involved in directing the company's position that
- 6 smoking does not cause disease?
- 7 MS. McGARRY: Object to the form of the
- 8 question.
- 9 A. Could you clarify "actively involved" for me
- 10 because I'm having some -- some difficulty with
- 11 this.
- 12 Q. Well he -- he sent out memos to the companies in
- 13 support of the position that smoking does not cause
- 14 disease?
- 15 A. It -- it's entirely possible that he did.
- 16 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 643 was marked
- for identification.)
- 18 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 19 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 20 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 643, this begins with the Bates
- 21 number 202213866; right?
- 22 A. It does indeed, yes.
- 23 Q. All right. And the first page is an
- 24 attachment -- I'm sorry, strike that.
- 25 The first page is a memo from Patrick Sheehy

- 1 entitled "Smoking and Health"; right?
- 2 A. The first page is a communi -- communication
- 3 from Patrick Sheehy entitled "Smoking and Health."
- 4 Q. And according to the document, it was circulated
- 5 to all number ones of tobacco companies?
- 6 A. The document bears the statement "Circulation:
- 7 All Number 1's of Tobacco Companies."
- 8 Q. And it was sent out to members of the B.A.T.
- 9 Industries board and other individuals; right?
- 10 A. Whether it was or wasn't, I don't obviously have
- 11 any specific knowledge, but certainly the document
- 12 says for -- for copying to members of the B.A.T.
- 13 Industries board and -- and also members of the BATCO
- 14 board and -- and some other specified individuals.
- 15 Q. Now, sir, this document begins by saying "You
- 16 will know that I believe we have a strong case, both
- 17 as an industry and as a company, in refuting the
- 18 highly emotive claims made by the anti-smoking lobby
- 19 regarding the dangers of smoking"; correct?
- 20 A. The document says that, yes.
- 21 Q. It goes on to say "I have a continuing active
- 22 involvement in this debate and have been encouraged
- 23 by a number of recent developments in the field of
- 24 epidemiology which appear to support our case and
- 25 which deserve to be more widely known"; right?

- 1 A. The document says that, yes.
- 2 Q. And, sir, did Sir Patrick Sheehy -- strike
- 3 that.
- 4 Was Sir Patrick Sheehy actively involved in
- 5 promoting on behalf of B.A.T. Industries the belief
- 6 that cigarette smoking does not cause disease?
- 7 A. Well that's a -- a -- a difficult question
- 8 because I don't think I'm in a position to deny
- 9 that -- what Sir Patrick has actually said himself.
- 10 He says "I have a continuing active involvement in
- 11 this debate," which I believe is a reference back to
- 12 the previous paragraph where he says "I believe we
- 13 have a strong case, both as an industry and as a
- 14 company, in refuting the highly emotive claims made
- 15 by the anti-smoking lobby regarding the dangers of
- 16 smoking."
- 17 And while we're on this subject, I -- I think I
- 18 would just want to refer to another paragraph that's
- 19 contained in this letter, because while Sir Patrick
- 20 appears from this document to take that view that, as
- 21 he says, "we have a strong case ... refuting the
- 22 highly emotive claims made by the anti-smoking lobby
- 23 regarding the dangers of smoking," it's interesting
- 24 that if one looks at the fourth paragraph -- and I
- 25 think I'd like to quote the four paragraph actually.

- 1 "Professor Burch provides a balanced view and he is
- 2 careful to make it clear that although experiments
- 3 which have been rigorously designed to ensure that
- 4 they provide a valid result show no causal
- 5 association between smoking and disease, it is not
- 6 possible to mount experiments on a sufficient scale
- 7 and over a sufficient time period such that this lack
- 8 of correlation can be proved beyond all reasonable
- 9 doubt."
- 10 In other words, Sir Patrick is saying is -- what
- 11 Sir Patrick is saying is that it is not -- the case
- 12 is not an open-and-shut case. He believes there to
- 13 be no causal association between smoking and disease,
- 14 but it's not possible to be absolutely definitive on
- 15 the subject, according to Professor Burch.
- 16 Q. Move to strike the nonresponsive portion of the
- 17 answer.
- Now, sir, Sir Patrick Sheehy attached a paper to
- 19 his memo, didn't he?
- 20 A. He says in the last paragraph "I hope that you
- 21 will find this paper encouraging and that the Tobacco
- 22 Companies ... find ways of using it, " et cetera,
- 23 et cetera, et cetera, and I'm just trying to find the
- 24 part in the letter where he actually refers to the --
- 25 yes, I think it's the third paragraph. "I thought

- 1 that it would be worthwhile to circulate copies of
- 2 the attached paper." Yes, he does have an attachment
- 3 to his paper.
- 4 Q. And the et cetera, et cetera that you referred
- 5 to in the last paragraph was his stated hope that the
- 6 paper would be used not only internally, but in
- 7 discussions with authorities and in a more general
- 8 public relations context in showing that although the
- 9 alternative view may be not as attractive to the
- 10 media, the claims of the opponents can and should be
- 11 challenged; right?
- 12 A. "... the extreme claims made by our opponents
- 13 can and should be challenged is I think the --
- MS. McGARRY: I didn't have time to
- 15 object. It was an incomplete quotation, including
- 16 more than what Mr. Wilson pointed out. I just wanted
- 17 to make that objection.
- 18 Q. Now, sir, you understand that B.A.T. Industries
- 19 publicly disputed the fact that cigarette smoking
- 20 caused disease; right?
- 21 MS. McGARRY: Objection, assumes facts not
- 22 in evidence.
- 23 A. B.A.T. Industries' position on this I think
- 24 is -- is -- is fairly clear. It recognizes that
- 25 there is a statistical association; in other words,

- 1 that smoking may be a risk factor in certain
- 2 diseases. What it denies is that there -- that
- 3 scientific proof has been advanced that there is a
- 4 causal connection between smoking and certain
- 5 diseases.
- 6 Q. And it has denied that publicly, hasn't it,
- 7 sir?
- 8 MS. McGARRY: I'm -- I will permit the
- 9 witness to answer, but I'm going to object on the
- 10 grounds that this is beyond the scope of the notice
- 11 of the deposition. In fact, I think earlier this
- 12 week you deposed someone on the subject of public
- 13 statements by B.A.T. Industries on smoking and
- 14 health, Mr. Proctor. But I'll let the witness answer
- 15 this particular question.
- 16 A. I believe representatives of B.A.T. Industries
- 17 have publicly stated that position, yes.
- 18 Q. And they publicly stated that position before
- 19 the fall of 1994; correct?
- 20 A. Before the fall of 1994? I can't -- I can't
- 21 remember a specific -- specific event. It's -- it's
- 22 possible.
- 23 Q. It's probable, isn't it, sir, since that policy
- 24 that it's based on was initiated in 1984? Right?
- MS. McGARRY: I am objecting. The

- 1 witness -- the question calls for speculation. It's
- 2 beyond the scope of the notice, and B.A.T. Industries
- 3 already produced a witness to you on this subject.
- 4 A. It's certainly possible, as I said before.
- 5 Q. Sir, and when representatives of B.A.T.
- 6 Industries made those statements, they expected --
- 7 strike that.
- 8 When representatives of B.A.T. Industries made
- 9 those statements that you've just referred to, it
- 10 would be reasonable for people to hear them and rely
- 11 on them, wouldn't it, sir?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection. This is beyond
- 13 the scope of this notice. We've already produced a
- 14 30.02(f) witness on this subject.
- 15 A. Could you read back the question, please.
- 16 Q. Certainly. And when representatives of B.A.T.
- 17 Industries made the statements that you've just
- 18 referred to, it would be reasonable for people who
- 19 heard them to rely on them, wouldn't it, sir?
- MS. McGARRY: Same objection.
- 21 A. I would anticipate that people would have heard
- 22 those statements or would have seen them reproduced.
- 23 Whether it was -- did you say rely on them?
- 24 Q. Reasonable for people to rely on them, yes.
- 25 A. May or may not have. I really don't know.

- 1 Q. All right. Well let me ask it this way: When
- 2 representatives of B.A.T. Industries made the
- 3 statements that you just referred to, would it be
- 4 reasonable for people to believe what B.A.T.
- 5 Industries was saying?
- 6 MS. McGARRY: Come on, Martha, this is
- 7 totally outside the scope. We already -- you asked
- 8 for a 30.02(f) witness on this subject and we
- 9 produced somebody. Does this mean that you're done
- 10 with your jurisdiction questions? This is completely
- 11 unfair. This is not the subject matter of this
- 12 deposition. Can you tell me what this has to do with
- 13 jurisdiction?
- If you're not going to link it up for me, I'm
- 15 not going to let the witness answer.
- MS. WIVELL: Let me rephrase the question.
- 17 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 18 Q. When representatives of B.A.T. Industries made
- 19 public statements on the subject that you just
- 20 referred to, it would be reasonable for people who
- 21 heard them to believe what B.A.T. Industries was
- 22 saying, wouldn't it?
- MS. McGARRY: Object to the form of the
- 24 question, object it's beyond the scope. And you
- 25 still haven't explained what this has to do with

- 1 jurisdiction. We've already produced a witness to
- 2 you on this exact topic.
- 3 A. Could you just read the question back again,
- 4 please.
- 5 Q. Certainly. When representatives --
- 6 MS. McGARRY: "When representatives of" --
- 7 MS. WIVELL: I'll read it, Counsel. Thank
- 8 you.
- 9 MS. McGARRY: Are you going to read it or
- 10 are you rephrasing it?
- MS. WIVELL: I said I would read it.
- MS. McGARRY: Okay.
- 13 Q. When representatives of B.A.T. Industries made
- 14 public statements on the subject that you just
- 15 referred to, it would be reasonable for people who
- 16 heard them to believe what B.A.T. Industries was
- 17 saying, wouldn't it, sir?
- MS. McGARRY: I object to the question.
- 19 A. I find it very difficult to state what other
- 20 people should believe, but clearly if the company's
- 21 position is something, it's unlikely that the company
- 22 is going to say it would be unreasonable for them to
- 23 believe the company's position.
- 24 Q. Okay. And, sir, do you know if public
- 25 statements made on the subject by B.A.T. Industries

- 1 representatives were published here in the United
- 2 States?
- 3 A. I -- I have no specific knowledge as to whether
- 4 they were or not. I'm -- I'm sorry.
- 5 Q. Now, sir, in addition to the meeting at Chelwood
- 6 that's discussed in Exhibit 643, the chairman of
- 7 B.A.T. Industries would hold annual conferences at
- 8 which subjects like smoking and health were
- 9 discussed; right?
- 10 A. I think I testified yesterday that conferences
- 11 were organized or conferences to which the CEOs, the
- 12 number ones of various businesses in the group, met.
- 13 I can't be sure as to the -- as I think I said
- 14 yesterday, as to exactly the exact frequency of these
- 15 meetings and exactly in which years they were held.
- 16 And I certainly can't confirm or deny that the
- 17 subject you mentioned was discussed at those
- 18 meetings.
- 19 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 644 was marked
- for identification.)
- 21 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 22 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 23 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 644, this is a document that
- 24 begins with the Bates number 107318466; right?
- 25 A. Correct, yes.

- 1 Q. This is a memo dated August 17th, 1983 from
- 2 E. A. A. Bruell to Dr. Ray Thornton?
- 3 A. It is, yes, a communication from E. A. A. Bruell
- 4 to Dr. R. A. Thornton.
- 5 Q. And the subject is "CAC" and then Roman numeral
- 6 "VIII"; right?
- 7 A. Correct, that's the heading on the document.
- 8 Q. All right. Have you learned what "CAC" means,
- 9 sir?
- 10 MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 11 A. I think I said yesterday -- I think you asked me
- 12 yesterday to undertake some investigation into the
- 13 subject, and I think we have already indicated this
- 14 morning that we are seeking clarification and are
- 15 going to come back to you on that subject, but I -- I
- 16 think I also said yesterday that I believed "CAC" was
- 17 a reference to Chairman's Advisory Conference or
- 18 something along those lines. I'm not absolutely
- 19 precise on it, but I --
- 20 MS. McGARRY: Actually what we said this
- 21 morning is that we determined that the -- we already
- 22 did an investigation and determined that
- 23 Mr. Broughton is knowledgable about this subject and
- 24 Mr. Broughton has been deposed and Mr. Broughton was
- 25 in fact deposed about CAC conferences, so I don't

- 1 think we're going to be doing -- undertaking any
- 2 further investigation.
- 3 MS. WIVELL: I think the question that I
- 4 had asked yesterday that wasn't answered was whether
- 5 the chairman that's referred to was the chairman of
- 6 B.A.T. Industries or the chairman of BATCO, and I
- 7 still would like a -- an answer to that.
- 8 Q. And you don't know that as you sit here today, I
- 9 take it.
- 10 A. I don't know that at this present time.
- 11 Q. All right. Sir, the first sentence of this
- 12 document states "The Chairman of BAT Industries will
- 13 be holding his annual conference from the 26th to"
- 14 the "29th" Sep -- "September in Friedrichsruhe, West
- 15 Germany"; correct?
- 16 A. The first sentence of the document says that,
- 17 and I would like, please, to read this document
- 18 before you ask me further questions --
- 19 Q. All right.
- 20 A. -- on it.
- 21 Q. Well before we go on, are you saying you've not
- 22 seen this document before, sir?
- 23 A. I don't believe I have seen this document
- 24 before, no.
- 25 Q. All right. You can go ahead and read it.

1	A. Thank	c you.
2		MS. WIVELL: Well maybe I should ask this:
3	What time	is it? Should we take our lunch break?
4		MS. McGARRY: 12:20.
5		MS. WIVELL: All right. Why don't we take
6	our lunch	break, come back at quarter to 2.
7		THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
8		(Luncheon recess taken at 12:19 o'clock
9		p.m.)
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

- 1 AFTERNOON SESSION
- 2 (Deposition reconvened at 1:40 o'clock
- 3 p.m.)
- 4 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 5 Q. All right. Before we go back to the document
- 6 that we were talking about before the noon recess, I
- 7 understand, Mr. Wilson, that you have been able to
- 8 find the answers to some of the questions that I
- 9 asked you yesterday. Is that right?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. Okay. I think one of the questions involved
- 12 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 626, the B.A.T. board guidelines
- 13 for public affairs.
- 14 A. I believe, yes.
- MS. McGARRY: That's 624.
- MS. WIVELL: I'm sorry. Let me restate the
- 17 question.
- 18 Q. I think one of the questions involved
- 19 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 624, the -- the B.A.T. board
- 20 guidelines for public affairs. Is that right?
- 21 A. Yes, it did, yes.
- 22 Q. All right. And I think I asked you was that
- 23 document sent to Brown & Williamson.
- 24 A. I think you did, yes.
- 25 Q. All right. And do you know the answer now?

- 1 A. The answer is that it appears to have been sent
- 2 to Brown & Williamson, yes.
- 3 Q. All right. Was it sent by B.A.T. Industries or
- 4 BATCO?
- 5 A. It was sent by someone who was at that time in
- 6 the employment of B.A.T. Industries.
- 7 Q. All right. Now the board that's referred to
- 8 here, do you know whether the reference to "BAT
- 9 BOARD" is to BATCO or B.A.T. Industries?
- 10 MS. McGARRY: Do you need the exhibit?
- 11 THE WITNESS: It would be helpful. Thank
- 12 you.
- 13 A. I believe the reference is to the board of
- 14 BATCO.
- 15 Q. All right. Have you checked the minutes of
- 16 B.A.T. Industries to determine whether they adopted
- 17 these public affairs guidelines?
- 18 A. Yes. The minutes of B.A.T. Industries' board
- 19 have been checked and there is no reference to
- 20 this -- this document in those minutes.
- 21 Q. All right. Have you checked the minutes of the
- 22 BATCO board?
- MS. McGARRY: No, I think we only
- 24 investigated what was in our B.A.T. Industries
- 25 files.

- 1 Q. But at the time this document was sent to
- 2 Brown & Williamson, T. J. Walker was an employee of
- 3 B.A.T. Industries?
- 4 A. T. J. Walker was an employee of B.A.T.
- 5 Industries at the time this document was sent, and I
- 6 think the other relevant consideration, if I may just
- 7 refer to it, is that the -- the document itself, the
- 8 attachment headed "1982 B.A.T. BOARD GUIDELINES,
- 9 PUBLIC AFFAIRS" actually carries the logo not of
- 10 B.A.T. Industries P.L.C., which we've seen on
- 11 numerous documents that you've presented to -- as
- 12 exhibits during this deposition, but in fact carries
- 13 the logo which was commonly used by British-American
- 14 Tobacco Company and I believe is in fact still used
- 15 today.
- 16 Q. Move to strike the nonresponsive portion of the
- 17 answer. Sir, was --
- MS. McGARRY: It's certainly responsive.
- 19 MS. WIVELL: Well I had asked him was T. J.
- 20 Walker an employee of B.A.T. Industries at the time
- 21 the document was sent.
- 22 Q. And the answer to that question is yes, sir?
- 23 A. The answer to that question is yes.
- 24 Q. What position did he have?
- 25 A. He worked in the chairman's office.

- 1 Q. And what did he do for the chairman?
- 2 A. He was an assistant of -- of some sort. I
- 3 said -- I think I just said "the chairman's office."
- 4 I think in fact he may have been an assistant to the
- 5 vice-chairman at that time, either the chairman or
- 6 the vice-chairman, but he was an assistant in the
- 7 office. He held no position as corporate secretary
- 8 or assistant secretary or anything of that nature.
- 9 He may have been -- he appears to have been in the
- 10 nature of a personal -- an administrative assistant
- 11 of some sort.
- 12 Q. Now I understand that another question that you
- 13 now have the answer to concerns Plaintiffs' Exhibit
- 14 626. Is that right?
- 15 A. Yes, indeed, yes.
- 16 Q. All right. And that is the proposed terms of
- 17 reference for the Tobacco Strategy Group?
- 18 A. Yes, the -- the proposed new terms of reference
- 19 for discussion at the TSG meeting on the 11th of May
- 20 1994.
- 21 Q. Do you understand -- or strike that.
- Do you now know whether or not the document
- 23 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 626 was discussed at the Tobacco
- 24 Strategy Group?
- 25 A. I believe it was discussed at that meeting and

- 1 the members of the TSG were asked to give further
- 2 comments on it.
- 3 Q. All right. And were the terms of reference
- 4 eventually adopted by the Tobacco Strategy Group?
- 5 A. It was not considered further by the Tobacco
- 6 Strategy Group.
- 7 Q. At any time?
- 8 A. Not so far as I can determine.
- 9 Q. All right. Were the terms of reference that had
- 10 been originally approved in 1984 and then reviewed in
- 11 1988 ever rejected by the Tobacco Strategy Review
- 12 Team?
- 13 A. I'm not aware that they were.
- 14 Q. Would it be fair to say that, to the best of
- 15 your knowledge, then the Tobacco Strategy Review Team
- 16 or, as it was later called, the Tobacco Strategy
- 17 Group operated under the terms of reference that were
- 18 initially adopted in 1984?
- 19 A. I have no knowledge that would -- that would
- 20 dispute that, save in respect that insofar as they
- 21 were amended in 1988.
- 22 Q. All right. I also understand that your counsel
- 23 is willing to let you answer a question that I asked
- 24 earlier in the day concerning whether Mr. Broughton's
- 25 approval was sought by Brown & Williamson. Do you

- 1 recall that line of questioning, sir?
- 2 A. Yes, I do.
- 4 him to answer whether or not he knows.
- 5 MS. WIVELL: I know. I'm just asking him
- 6 to recall that line of questioning.
- 7 MS. McGARRY: Okay.
- 8 Q. Sir, was Mr. Broughton's approval sought by
- 9 Brown & Williamson before it agreed to drop its
- 10 lawsuit against Jeffrey Wigand as part of the tobacco
- 11 settlement negotiations that took place this summer?
- 12 A. I do not know.
- 13 Q. Do you have the answer to any of the other
- 14 questions that I asked you yesterday that you were
- 15 unable to answer?
- MS. McGARRY: I'm not aware of any others.
- 17 I -- I thought we pulled up everything that was --
- 18 yeah, he was going to clarify testimony about
- 19 insurance, but that wasn't one of the open questions,
- 20 I don't think.
- 21 MS. WIVELL: All right. Let me just check
- 22 here.
- 23 Q. Oh, I yesterday asked you about whether the
- 24 phrase -- or what the phrase the, quote, "BAT
- 25 Industries Tobacco Division" meant. Do you know

- 1 that, sir?
- 2 MS. McGARRY: That was -- we addressed that
- 3 earlier. That's in the document written by Carl
- 4 Schoenbachler or bachler, whatever.
- 5 THE WITNESS: Schoenbachler.
- 6 MS. McGARRY: And we determined that he's
- 7 never been an employee of B.A.T. Industries and so
- 8 B.A.T. Industries doesn't know what he meant.
- 9 Q. Well, sir, do you know what the phrase "the BAT
- 10 Industries Tobacco Division" means?
- 11 A. It doesn't have any meaning to me at all.
- 12 Q. I think I asked you yesterday whether the board
- 13 of B.A.T. Industries P.L.C. approved Sir Patrick
- 14 Sheehy setting up the Tobacco Strategy Review Team.
- 15 Do you recall that generally, sir?
- 16 A. I -- yes, I have a recollection of you asking a
- 17 question along those lines.
- 18 Q. I think --
- 19 MS. McGARRY: I think we covered yesterday
- 20 that that was testified to by Mr. Broughton and that
- 21 Mr. Wilson had reviewed Mr. Broughton's deposition
- 22 testimony and he had no information to the contrary.
- 23 MS. WIVELL: All right. Well let me just
- 24 ask the question, sir.
- 25 Q. Do you know as you sit here today whether the

- 1 B.A.T. Industries board approved Sir Patrick Sheehy
- 2 setting up the Tobacco Strategy Review Team?
- 3 A. Sorry, could you just repeat the question
- 4 again. I beg your pardon.
- 5 Q. Do you know as you sit here today whether --
- 6 strike that.
- 7 Did the B.A.T. Industries board approve Sir
- 8 Patrick Sheehy setting up the Tobacco Strategy Review
- 9 Team?
- 10 A. I do not know, but I gave testimony that I had
- 11 seen Mr. Broughton's answer in deposition which said
- 12 that Sir Patrick Sheehy had established the Tobacco
- 13 Strategy Review Team.
- 14 Q. But it would be fair to say you still don't know
- 15 whether the board approved Sir Patrick's doing so;
- 16 right?
- 17 A. I -- at the moment, no, I do not know.
- 18 Q. I asked you yesterday whether -- oh, I'm sorry,
- 19 strike that.
- 20 I asked you yesterday what the purposes of the
- 21 CAC were. Do you recall that generally?
- 22 A. I do recall a line of questioning on the CAC,
- 23 yeah.
- MS. McGARRY: And I told you this morning
- 25 we hadn't done any further investigation because we

- 1 determined that Mr. Broughton knows about the
- 2 purposes of the CAC conferences and you asked
- 3 Mr. Broughton that exact same question and
- 4 Mr. Broughton answered it, and therefore you have
- 5 taken the deposition of a representative of B.A.T.
- 6 Industries on the issue and so Mr. Wilson has not
- 7 done any further investigation.
- 8 MS. WIVELL: All right. I said at that
- 9 time I would appreciate it if you would find out and
- 10 report back so I could have B.A.T. Industries'
- 11 testimony on that subject or be provided with a
- 12 witness who could answer the question.
- 13 Q. And, Mr. Wilson, do you know the purpose of the
- 14 CAC?
- 15 A. No, I do not.
- MS. WIVELL: Okay. I would repeat my
- 17 request.
- 18 Q. I also asked you yesterday whether B.A.T.
- 19 Industries approved the contract under which Dr. Lee
- 20 was hired to do the cohort analysis. Do you recall
- 21 that generally?
- 22 A. I do recall that question, yes.
- 23 Q. Did B.A.T. Industries approve the contract under
- 24 which Dr. Lee was hired to do the cohort analysis?
- 25 A. A review of the minutes of the board of B.A.T.

- 1 Industries indicate no reference to such a contract,
- 2 nor do the registers of any documents or contracts
- 3 entered into by B.A.T. Industries demonstrate that it
- 4 was ever connected with that contract.
- 5 Q. Sir, I asked you yesterday whether the
- 6 Compendium of Epidemiological Studies was supplied to
- 7 Brown & Williamson for its use. Do you recall that,
- 8 sir?
- 9 A. Yes, I think I do recall.
- 10 Q. The Compendium of Epidemiological Studies was
- 11 supplied to Brown & Williamson for its use, wasn't
- 12 it, sir?
- 13 A. I -- I -- I'm -- I'm afraid I can't recall. I
- 14 simply don't know.
- 15 Q. There were some questions that I asked you this
- 16 morning that you were unable to answer. Have you
- 17 been able to answer -- or find out the answer to any
- 18 of those questions over the lunch break?
- 19 A. I -- could you please refresh my memory as to
- 20 what the questions were.
- 21 Q. Well there were several and I don't have a
- 22 transcript written out here. I recall questions
- 23 concerning public statements that were approved by
- 24 Mr. Sheehy. Do you recall that, sir?
- 25 A. I recall some questions along those lines, but

- 1 I'd like the questions to be read back to me. My
- 2 recollection is no more firm at the moment than
- 3 yours.
- 4 Q. Well let me ask you this: Over the lunch hour
- 5 did you try and investigate to find out the answers
- 6 to any of the questions that I asked this morning?
- 7 A. I think I answered the questions that were put
- 8 to me this morning. I didn't take any steps to
- 9 obtain further clarification during the lunch break.
- 10 MS. McGARRY: Mr. Wilson also would like
- 11 the opportunity to correct his testimony yesterday
- 12 concerning the procurement of excess public liability
- 13 policies, if that's all right.
- 14 MS. WIVELL: Well I'd prefer you to do it
- 15 in your direct exam --
- MS. McGARRY: That's fine.
- 17 MS. WIVELL: -- if you wouldn't mind.
- 18 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 19 Q. Sir, can we turn our attention to Exhibit 644.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Now you've had the opportunity to read this;
- 22 correct?
- 23 A. Yes, I have.
- 24 Q. Are there minutes of the CAC meeting that are
- 25 referred to here?

- 1 A. If there are, I've never seen them.
- 2 Q. You understand that there was a debate
- 3 concerning the smoking -- I'm sorry, strike that.
- 4 You understand that at this meeting there was a
- 5 debate on smoking issues?
- 6 A. I -- the -- I understand that the letter says
- 7 that on Tuesday, the 27th, which I take to be
- 8 Tuesday, the 27th of September 1983, at 0845 hours
- 9 there would be a debate on smoking issues.
- 10 Q. There was such a debate at the CAC meeting that
- 11 is referenced in Exhibit 644, wasn't there, sir?
- 12 A. I have no knowledge as to whether there was or
- 13 was not.
- 14 Q. Do you have any knowledge of what went on there
- 15 other than what you've read in this document?
- 16 A. No knowledge at all, no.
- 17 Q. Okay. So beyond what's here, you couldn't
- 18 answer any of my questions concerning what was said
- 19 at that meeting; right?
- 20 A. I couldn't answer your questions concerning what
- 21 was said at a meeting which took place in August
- 22 1983, no.
- 23 Q. And you have never discussed what went on at
- 24 that meeting with anyone?
- 25 A. I have not, no.

- 1 Q. Okay. So as you sit here today, you have no
- 2 information to dispute what is said in this memo, do
- 3 you, sir?
- 4 A. I have no information which will confirm or
- 5 dispute what is said in this memo.
- 6 Q. Were there handouts of presentations that were
- 7 made at this meeting, sir?
- 8 A. I've previously testified that I do not know
- 9 what took place at this meeting.
- 10 Q. And I think my question's a little bit
- 11 different.
- 12 Have you seen handouts which refer to what went
- 13 on at this meeting?
- 14 A. I have no recollection of having seen handouts
- 15 of matters which were referred to --
- 16 Q. Now --
- 17 A. -- at this meeting.
- 18 Q. Sorry.
- 19 Now at one time B.A.T. Industries had financial
- 20 invest -- investments in biotechnical agribusiness
- 21 ventures; correct?
- 22 A. Yes, it did, yes.
- 23 Q. All right. And with whom -- strike that.
- What were the nature of those investments?
- 25 A. They were investments in --

- 1 In the first instance, they were investments in
- 2 joint-venture companies which carried on
- 3 biotechnology agribusiness research on a -- I think
- 4 on a number of agricultural plants in -- I think in
- 5 South America, and in the second instance there was
- 6 an investment in a company in the United Kingdom
- 7 which I believe carried on similar research.
- 8 Q. Who was the joint venture in South America
- 9 with?
- 10 A. I believe the joint venture was between one of
- 11 the subsidiaries of B.A.T. Industries and a company
- 12 called Native Plant, NPI. I think it was Native
- 13 Plants, I think was the name of the -- NPI is I think
- 14 what it was called.
- 15 Q. And the plant that -- strike that.
- 16 One of the agricultural plants that was being
- 17 investigated as part of this joint venture was
- 18 tobacco, wasn't it, sir?
- 19 A. I believe there was research on the tobacco
- 20 plant.
- 21 Q. All right. And what was the nature of the
- 22 research on the tobacco plant that was being done as
- 23 part of the NIP joint venture?
- 24 A. I --
- MS. McGARRY: NPI.

- 1 MS. WIVELL: Sorry. Let me rephrase the
- 2 question.
- 3 Q. What was the nature of the research of the
- 4 tobacco plant that was being done as part of the NPI
- 5 joint venture?
- 6 A. I think it was basic -- I -- I really don't
- 7 know. It was basic -- basic research. What I do
- 8 know is that it -- none of the research resulted in
- 9 any practical application.
- 10 Q. Sir, you said it was a joint venture. Who were
- 11 the parties to the joint venture?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, asked and
- 13 answered. We're still on South America.
- 14 A. I think I previously testified that the parties
- 15 to the joint venture were a subsidiary of B.A.T.
- 16 Industries in South America and NPI.
- 17 Q. And B.A.T. Industries was not a direct party?
- 18 A. In that joint venture --
- 19 Q. Yes, sir.
- 20 A. -- not as far as I know. I have to -- on this
- 21 subject, I have to say my recollection is a little
- 22 bit vague.
- 23 Q. All right. You understand that the research
- 24 that was being done was basic molecular research?
- 25 A. I think that's correct, yes.

- 1 Q. And what was -- strike that.
- 2 The purpose of this research was to try and
- 3 genetically engineer tobacco with a higher nicotine
- 4 content; isn't that true?
- 5 A. Can I -- let me just step back and put the thing
- 6 into a -- into a perspective. My understanding of
- 7 the situation is that in the early 1980s or mid-1980s
- 8 B.A.T. Industries as a -- as an investment company,
- 9 as a holding company owning investments, was looking
- 10 at ways of diversifying. It was always looking at
- 11 ways of diversifying to see where else it could add
- 12 value to the business, and I believe that Sir Patrick
- 13 Sheehy had a particular interest in biotechnology and
- 14 thought -- saw the area of biotechnology as a -- as
- 15 an additional business area that the company may be
- 16 able to -- may be able to invest in or to -- you
- 17 know, to -- to develop as a new business, to add to
- 18 retail or tobacco or the other things the company was
- 19 then -- then held investments in.
- 20 And that was the basis of these -- these --
- 21 these joint ventures. That was the purpose of the --
- 22 the -- the investments, and as I've said before, one
- 23 of the agricultural plants that the joint ventures
- 24 or -- research done by the joint ventures actually
- 25 was done on ag -- the tobacco plant.

- 1 Q. And as part of that research, work was done on
- 2 trying to genetically engineer tobacco plants so that
- 3 they would have an increased nicotine content; isn't
- 4 that true?
- 5 A. I -- that's just too specific for me to answer.
- 6 I don't know whether that is -- is -- I -- I don't
- 7 have a recollection of that being the case. I -- I
- 8 just don't know that.
- 9 Q. All right. Is --
- 10 Have you described for us everything you know
- 11 about the joint venture with NPI?
- 12 A. Yes, I think I -- I think I have.
- 13 Q. Did Sir Patrick actually go to South America to
- 14 look at the work that was being done?
- 15 A. I have no knowledge of whether Sir Patrick
- 16 Sheehy went to South America.
- 17 Q. Was any of the work that was done done in the
- 18 United States?
- 19 A. I have seen a reference somewhere to some
- 20 analysis in -- yeah, in the United States. I
- 21 think -- I think -- I think that's right.
- 22 Q. Where was that analysis done?
- 23 A. I believe it was Salt Lake City. I think Salt
- 24 Lake City. I can't tell you what the analysis was
- 25 and what was done and -- but I -- I think I'm right

- 1 in saying that. I'm sorry, my recollection is -- on
- 2 these matters is fairly vaque and the other thing is
- 3 I'm -- I'm not a scientist, so I don't understand
- 4 things, you know.
- 5 Q. What was the nature of the analysis that was
- 6 done?
- 7 A. I say I -- I -- I really couldn't tell you.
- 8 Q. All right. And that was done as part of the
- 9 joint venture with Native Plants?
- 10 A. I think it was done as part of the -- the joint
- 11 venture in South Africa with Native Plants. South
- 12 America. Sorry. If I said "South Africa" before, I
- 13 meant South America with Native Plants. I believe
- 14 that's -- that's right, yes.
- 15 Q. Now you also mentioned that there was some
- 16 involvement with an investment in the United
- 17 Kingdom.
- 18 A. Yes, that's right.
- 19 Q. What do you know about that?
- 20 A. I believe that was an investment with a company
- 21 called Twyford, and Twyford owned a laboratory and
- 22 B.A.T. Industries made -- made payments, in --
- 23 invested in Twyford essentially, made payments to
- 24 Twyford, and Twyford carried out its research, its
- 25 own research, at its own laboratory.

- 1 Q. What was the nature of the research?
- 2 A. I think it was again basic research on
- 3 agricultural plants. I believe that that's the
- 4 case.
- 5 Q. On tobacco, wasn't it, sir?
- 6 A. I don't think it was limited to tobacco. I
- 7 think it was a range of -- a range of products, which
- 8 would be, as I said earlier, I think consistent with
- 9 what I said earlier, which was that B.A.T. or Sir
- 10 Patrick Sheehy was interested in seeing whether there
- 11 was another business that the group could invest in
- 12 as a -- as another -- as an addition to its other
- 13 businesses.
- 14 Q. But tobacco was amongst the plants that was
- 15 looked at for this genetic research; right?
- 16 A. I think it may have been. I may be confusing
- 17 that with NPI, but it -- it may have been. I -- I --
- 18 I can't confirm definitely or -- I'm sorry, I just --
- 19 just don't know.
- 20 Q. What was the purpose of the work that was done
- 21 with Twyford?
- MS. McGARRY: I'm -- I'm going to permit
- 23 the witness to answer, but I'm going to object. I
- 24 don't really see how research done at a laboratory in
- 25 the United Kingdom is relevant to jurisdiction in

- 1 Minnesota. But I'll permit the witness to answer if
- 2 he knows.
- 3 A. Could -- could you just read the question back
- 4 to me, please.
- 5 Q. Certainly. What was the purpose of the work
- 6 that was done with Twyford?
- 7 A. I think the work was done by Twyford, not with
- 8 Twyford. And I don't really know what the purpose of
- 9 the work was. I think I said earlier I couldn't even
- 10 be sure whether they were doing work on the tobacco
- 11 plant, as you -- you asked me, so I -- I really
- 12 can't -- I'd be speculating as to the purpose.
- 13 The general purpose, as I said earlier, I think
- 14 was that B.A.T. Industries was looking at the
- 15 possibility of developing a new area of business in
- 16 which to invest.
- 17 Q. All right. I'm trying to understand what it was
- 18 about this research that made Sir Patrick think it
- 19 was a good potential area for investment. Do you
- 20 know the answer to that question?
- 21 A. I don't know the answer, but I can easily
- 22 understand that in the mid-1980s there would have
- 23 been a lot of enthusiasm about biotechnology because
- 24 biotechnology was a very big sort of growth subject I
- 25 think even then, and I can recollect just from

- 1 general knowledge that there was a great deal of
- 2 interest in the whole subject of biotechnology. And
- 3 I believe even fairly recently biotechnology
- 4 companies have been taking major steps forward on the
- 5 various capital markets where they're -- where
- 6 they're listed, so I'm not -- not surprised about
- 7 it.
- 8 Q. Did NPI or Twyford do any of the work relating
- 9 to Y-1 tobacco?
- 10 A. I -- I honestly can't tell you. I -- I just
- 11 don't know.
- 12 Q. You understand what "Y-1" refers to, don't you,
- 13 sir?
- 14 A. I -- I know I've heard the expression "Y-1." I
- 15 wouldn't say that I can give you an accurate
- 16 assessment as to what Y-1 is, but I -- I have a --
- 17 yeah, I think a --
- 18 Q. Y-1 --
- 19 MS. McGARRY: May I just ask for
- 20 clarification. When you say "NPI," you mean NPI, the
- 21 company, or the joint venture that was formed between
- 22 NPI and the --
- MS. WIVELL: The --
- MS. McGARRY: -- sub?
- 25 MS. WIVELL: -- joint venture, the joint

- 1 venture.
- 2 MS. McGARRY: Okay.
- 3 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 4 Q. Y-1 was genetically engineered tobacco; right?
- 5 MS. McGARRY: I object. This is beyond the
- 6 scope of the jurisdiction notice, but if the witness
- 7 knows, I'll permit him to answer this question.
- 8 A. Well I'm not a scientist, but I understand that
- 9 Y-1 -- my understanding is that Y-1 was a strain of
- 10 tobacco which was first developed by the -- I believe
- 11 by the Department of Agriculture here in the United
- 12 States. I believe that to be the case, but please
- 13 don't hold me to it because, as I say, I'm not a
- 14 scientist; I don't understand these things.
- 15 Q. Did Sir Patrick Sheehy take part in decisions
- 16 approving the decision to go forward with the
- 17 development of Y-1?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 19 A. Well I don't really understand. When you talk
- 20 about decisions to go forward with the development
- 21 of -- of Y-1, I'm not sure what you're referring to.
- 22 Q. All right. Well let me back up.
- You understand that Brown & Williamson entered
- 24 into contracts with DNAP Labs to develop Y-1?
- 25 A. No, I don't understand that. I don't have

- 1 knowledge of that, sorry.
- 2 Q. You understand that Y-1 was eventually grown --
- 3 strike that.
- 4 Y-1 was eventually grown by Brown & Williamson
- 5 in South America; right?
- 6 MS. McGARRY: Objection. I don't see what
- 7 this has to do with jurisdiction. B&W isn't
- 8 contesting jurisdiction in this case. Can you
- 9 explain what this has to do with jurisdiction over
- 10 B.A.T. Industries.
- 11 MS. WIVELL: Yes, I'm trying to tie it up
- 12 and trying to explain it to him since he asked me a
- 13 question.
- 14 Q. You understand that --
- MS. McGARRY: Well I need the explanation
- 16 before I let the witness go down this road of asking
- 17 questions that are beyond the scope.
- 18 MS. WIVELL: I am -- I don't believe it's
- 19 beyond the scope because I'm trying to determine
- 20 whether B.A.T. Industries had anything to do with the
- 21 decision that Brown & Williamson made to engage in
- 22 the development of Y-1. That's where I'm going.
- 23 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 24 Q. Now, sir, let me ask the question again. You
- 25 under -- strike that.

- 1 You -- strike that.
- 2 Brown & Williamson entered into contracts with
- 3 DNAP Labs to develop Y-1?
- 4 A. I -- I think I've just testified that I don't --
- 5 I have no knowledge of that.
- 6 Q. And do you have any knowledge of whether Sir
- 7 Patrick Sheehy or anyone from B.A.T. Industries was
- 8 involved in the Brown & Williamson decision to enter
- 9 into those contracts?
- 10 A. Well I -- I just --
- 11 MS. McGARRY: I'm going to object because
- 12 it assumes facts not in evidence, but you may
- 13 answer.
- 14 A. I've just testified that I -- I didn't -- I have
- 15 no knowledge of those contracts, so I certainly have
- 16 no knowledge of whether anyone at B.A.T. Industries
- 17 was involved in the decision to enter into any such
- 18 contracts.
- MS. WIVELL: Well for the record, I'd like
- 20 to say that I am deposing B.A.T. Industries and would
- 21 request that they produce for me a witness who is
- 22 knowledgable on whether anyone from B.A.T. Industries
- 23 was involved in the decision to go forward with Y-1 $\,$
- 24 and, if so, what that involvement would be.
- 25 Q. Sir, if --

- 1 Do you know anything about the development of
- 2 Y-1?
- 3 A. I think I've told you what I know about Y-1.
- 4 Q. So it would be fair to say that any further
- 5 questions that I might ask you on that subject you
- 6 would not be able to answer?
- 7 A. It would be fair to say that. Yes, it would be
- 8 fair to say that.
- 9 Q. All right. Do you know if Y-1 was approved by
- 10 the -- well strike that.
- 11 Was Y-1 approved by the Tobacco Strategy Review
- 12 Team?
- 13 MS. McGARRY: Objection. The witness said
- 14 that he doesn't know anything else about --
- 15 A. I don't know.
- MS. McGARRY: -- Y-1. I suggest you ask
- 17 these questions to B&W or Sir Patrick.
- 18 Is this the affidavit that's referred to, the
- 19 single affidavit referred to in your predesignation
- 20 letter?
- 21 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 645 was marked
- for identification.)
- 23 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 24 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 25 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 645, this is a copy of an

- 1 affidavit which you filed in The State of Florida
- 2 case; correct?
- 3 A. Yes. It appears to be so, yes.
- 4 MS. McGARRY: Can you answer my question,
- 5 Marti?
- 6 Q. Sir --
- 7 MS. McGARRY: Can you answer my question,
- 8 Marti?
- 9 MS. WIVELL: I'm not here to have my
- 10 deposition taken. Now --
- 11 MS. McGARRY: Okay. Well I'm going to
- 12 allow -- the designation notice said you were going
- 13 to ask Mr. Wilson about one affidavit, so this will
- 14 be the one affidavit you ask him about.
- MS. WIVELL: And what -- what's the grounds
- 16 for that, Counsel? I just want to know what --
- MS. McGARRY: There's a pre --
- 18 MS. WIVELL: -- rule of law allows you to
- 19 limit me to one affidavit.
- 20 MS. McGARRY: There's an order from Judge
- 21 Fitzpatrick that says you must predesignate the
- 22 documents you're going to use at a deposition.
- MS. WIVELL: Uh-huh.
- MS. McGARRY: And you predesignated, and
- 25 your predesignation list says "Affidavit," in the

- 1 singular, "of" David "Wilson." It doesn't define
- 2 what case it's in.
- 3 MS. WIVELL: Yes, and --
- 4 MS. McGARRY: And I asked you to explain
- 5 what case that affidavit was in and you wouldn't tell
- 6 me. So you've now given him an affidavit and I asked
- 7 you if this is the affidavit and you still won't tell
- 8 me, so I'm telling you that you said you were going
- 9 to ask about one affidavit so this will be the one
- 10 affidavit.
- 11 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 12 Q. Now, sir --
- MS. McGARRY: And the authority is the rule
- 14 of Judge -- the order of Judge Fitzpatrick.
- MS. WIVELL: Excuse me, could you not
- 16 interrupt me, Counsel. You've done it over and over
- 17 and over again, and I've been patient. I would just
- 18 appreciate if you would just please not interrupt me
- 19 while I'm talking.
- 20 Q. Sir, turning your attention to page three, this
- 21 affidavit refers to B.A.T. Industries' financial
- 22 investments in biotechnology agribusiness ventures;
- 23 correct?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. All right. Have we now talked about what you

- 1 are referring to here in this affidavit?
- 2 A. Yes. Yes, we have. I mean, this is the -- this
- 3 is essentially -- what I've been talking about is
- 4 essentially what is contained within here, yes.
- 5 Q. All right. Does B.A.T. Industries have any
- 6 further information on this business venture or these
- 7 business ventures that you have not told us about
- 8 here today?
- 9 A. I don't believe so. I -- I -- I'm not
- 10 going to be categoric about it, but I certainly -- I
- 11 don't -- personally I do not believe so, but I --
- 12 I -- I can't say more than that.
- 13 Q. Now, sir, where did you get the information for
- 14 this affidavit?
- 15 A. This information was supplied to me following a
- 16 thorough review of documents which I believe had
- 17 become -- become available during the course of
- 18 document production in connection with the U.S.
- 19 litigation, when it was discovered that in fact
- 20 despite my earlier affidavits, there -- there had
- 21 been some investments in -- you know, in -- in
- 22 this -- in this field, and I think my earlier
- 23 affidavit, while not in fact wrong, may have created
- 24 a -- you know, a misimpression. And the purpose of
- 25 swearing this affidavit, as I recall, was to correct

- 1 any mis -- misimpression.
- 2 Q. Now the affidavit that you filed in The State of
- 3 Minnesota case did not reference this biotechnology
- 4 agribusiness ventures, did it?
- 5 A. I believe that to be correct, yes. You're --
- 6 you're -- what you're saying is -- is correct, and
- 7 can I just go further and say that I believe -- I
- 8 believe that subsequently when this affidavit, which
- 9 was filed in, as you said, Florida -- when this
- 10 affidavit was formed by me, I believe I'm correct in
- 11 saying that my counsel brought this to the attention
- 12 of plaintiffs in the Minnesota action so that you
- 13 were put on notice that to the extent that my earlier
- 14 statement had -- my earlier affidavit had not dealt
- 15 with this matter, that I was filing -- I had filed a
- 16 supplemental affidavit in Florida and this was
- 17 pertinent to what I had also said in Minnesota.
- 18 Q. Have you filed a supplemental affidavit in
- 19 Minnesota?
- 20 A. I think beyond -- as I've just said, beyond the
- 21 fact that this affidavit was given to plaintiffs to
- 22 inform them of the position, I do not think I have
- 23 actually filed a supplemental affidavit in Minnesota,
- 24 but I -- I -- I think that -- I -- I think -- I think
- 25 that's -- that's the case.

- 1 Q. All right. Now it says at the bottom of this
- 2 page "In 1988, B.A.T Industries relinquished its
- 3 interest in one of these ventures " Which
- 4 venture did it relinquish its interest in?
- 5 A. I believe that is a reference to the interest in
- 6 the Twyford venture.
- 7 Q. Did it sell its interest?
- 8 A. I don't know. I don't know actually that it
- 9 sold its interest. It simply ceased to make any
- 10 further investment in that company. I -- I can't
- 11 recall specifically as I sit here whether the
- 12 investment consisted of a share holding or whether
- 13 B.A.T. Industries just -- I think B.A.T. Industries
- 14 made cash contributions to Twyford and Twyford
- 15 carried on business as a biotechnology company, and I
- 16 believe B.A.T. Industries just simply severed its
- 17 connection with -- with Twyford. And I think, as it
- 18 says here, that the -- at the time that that
- 19 happened, Twyford's laboratory, biotechnology
- 20 laboratory, was transferred to -- to BATCO.
- 21 Q. And what happened to the NPI research joint
- 22 venture?
- 23 A. I -- I'm -- at the moment I'm -- I'm sorry, I --
- 24 I -- I just don't know. I think the -- I think
- 25 the -- my -- I said I don't know. I -- my

- 1 recollection is that the -- the research didn't
- 2 progress. The -- the -- the research that the joint
- 3 venture was conducting in South America didn't
- 4 progress to a stage where it presented anything that
- 5 was going to be of any use in terms of commercial
- 6 exploitation, and the -- I think the -- essentially
- 7 the venture just simply ceased to have any -- I mean,
- 8 I just think, you know, B.A.T. just didn't -- didn't,
- 9 you know, pursue its interest any further, but I --
- 10 I -- I'm not sure about the absolute specifics, but
- 11 I -- that's what I understand.
- 12 Q. Is that joint venture still ongoing?
- 13 A. I -- my recollection is that B.A.T. Industries
- 14 had written off any interest in that joint venture
- 15 some years ago.
- 16 Q. Now, sir, B.A.T. Industries has funded research
- 17 on the subject of smoking and health, hasn't it?
- 18 A. B.A.T. Industries has funded research on the
- 19 subject of smoking and health? I would have expected
- 20 subsidiaries of B.A.T. Industries to have funded
- 21 research on the subject of smoking and health. I'm
- 22 not personally aware of any research on smoking and
- 23 health that B.A.T. Industries P.L.C. itself has
- 24 funded.
- 25 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 646 was marked

- for identification.)
- 2 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 3 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 4 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 646, this is a document Bates
- 5 numbered 109068035; correct?
- 6 A. Correct.
- 7 Q. It's entitled "1987 BATUKE Work Programme:
- 8 Project Areas Attributed to BAT Industries"; right?
- 9 A. It is so headed, yes.
- 10 Q. Have you seen this document before, sir?
- 11 A. Yes, I have.
- 12 Q. All right. What was the context in which you
- 13 saw this document previously?
- 14 A. I was shown this document by counsel in the
- 15 course of preparation for my deposition.
- 16 Q. All right. This document shows down the left
- 17 side various product research projects; right?
- 18 A. It shows a number of matters which are -- appear
- 19 to have the heading, yes, "Product Research," yes.
- 20 Q. And then on the side there are three columns;
- 21 right?
- 22 A. Yes, there are some boxes with three columns,
- 23 yes.
- 24 Q. Now at the top of the first two boxes on the
- 25 left is the heading "Proposed Project Funding"?

- 1 A. Yes, that's right.
- 2 Q. And then it says "BAT Industries" at the head of
- 3 one column and then "BATCo" at the head of the
- 4 second; correct?
- 5 A. That's what it says, yes.
- 6 Q. Was B.A.T. -- I'm sorry.
- 7 Did B.A.T. Industries pay the funding of the
- 8 projects that are listed under the heading "BAT
- 9 Industries"?
- 10 A. I have no knowledge as to whether they did or
- 11 didn't, but my suspicion is that they didn't because
- 12 B.A.T. Industries is not involved in, you know,
- 13 research projects, scientific research projects or
- 14 projects of this sort itself. It would be done by
- 15 the tobacco companies, and as you yourself noted, the
- 16 document is -- or the columns are headed "Proposed
- 17 Project Funding." This was clearly a proposal, a
- 18 draft of some sort. To whom it was submitted and
- 19 to -- by -- whether it was ever agreed to, I have
- 20 absolutely no knowledge.
- 21 Q. I'm going to move to strike the portion of the
- 22 answer after the phrase "whether they did or
- 23 didn't."
- Now, sir, you don't know as you sit here right
- 25 now whether the -- B.A.T. Industries paid the funding

- 1 for the projects that appear under its name in this
- 2 column; isn't that true?
- 3 MS. McGARRY: I object to the form of the
- 4 question, mischaracterizes the document.
- 5 A. Could you reread the question for me, please.
- 6 Q. Certainly. As you sit here today, you don't
- 7 know one way or the other whether B.A.T. Industries
- 8 paid for the -- paid the funding for the projects
- 9 which are listed under its name in Exhibit 464?
- 10 A. As I sit here today, I have no knowledge as --
- 11 as to whether or not B.A.T. Industries funded any of
- 12 these projects which are specified in the list of
- 13 product research here on this document.
- 14 THE REPORTER: It's Exhibit 646.
- 15 MS. WIVELL: Thank you. All right. Let me
- 16 rephrase the question since I appear to be dyslexic
- 17 toward the end of these four days.
- MS. McGARRY: Well we're all getting
- 19 tired.
- 20 Q. As you sit here today, you don't know one way or
- 21 the other whether B.A.T. Industries paid or funded
- 22 the projects that are listed under its name in
- 23 Exhibit 646, do you, sir?
- MS. McGARRY: Object to the form of the
- 25 question.

- 1 A. As I sit here today, I have no knowledge as to
- 2 whether the -- B.A.T. Industries funded the projects
- 3 which are -- sorry, the -- yes, the -- the -- the
- 4 projects which are specified under the heading --
- 5 heading "Product Research" on this page of this
- 6 document.
- 7 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 8 (Recess taken.)
- 9 (Record read by the court reporter
- off the record.)
- 11 A. And I make the same point in connection with the
- 12 other projects which are referred to on pages two and
- 13 three of the document so there's no misunderstanding
- 14 that the answer I've given in respect to page one
- 15 also applies in respect of the other pages of the
- 16 document.
- 17 Q. Well when you saw this document before the
- 18 deposition, did you do anything to try and determine
- 19 whether B.A.T. Industries paid or funded the projects
- 20 that are listed under its name in this document?
- 21 A. No, I didn't.
- 22 Q. If you wanted to determine whether or not B.A.T.
- 23 Industries funded those proposals that are listed
- 24 under its name in Exhibit 646, how would you go about
- 25 answering that question?

- 1 A. Well I think it would be probably a
- 2 several-stage project. I think in the first instance
- 3 I would seek to find out who produced this proposal,
- 4 whether the proposal -- proposal was ever referred to
- 5 B.A.T. Industries, and if it was not referred to
- 6 B.A.T. Industries, that would obviously be indicative
- 7 that B.A.T. Industries did not fund these projects.
- 8 And I would also request an examination of the
- 9 accounting records of B.A.T. Industries for 1987
- 10 possibly to see whether there was any payments made
- 11 in connection with these projects.
- 12 That's, I suppose, the -- the approach I
- 13 would take.
- 14 Q. Does B.A.T. Industries have an accountant?
- 15 A. B.A.T. Industries, yeah, yes, does have an
- 16 accountant.
- 17 O. Who is that?
- 18 A. The -- the chief accountant for B.A.T.
- 19 Industries is -- is David Potter.
- 20 Q. Did you make an attempt to find out from
- 21 Mr. Potter whether or not B.A.T. Industries funded
- 22 the proposals that are listed here?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, asked and
- 24 answered.
- 25 A. I did not make a -- an inquiry of Mr. Potter as

- 1 to whether B.A.T. Industries funded these projects
- 2 specified in this document.
- 3 Q. Sir, we have talked earlier in this deposition
- 4 about a period of time beginning approximately April
- 5 of 1990 when Brown & Williamson began reporting
- 6 directly to B.A.T. Industries. Do you recall that,
- 7 sir?
- 8 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 9 Q. All right. And during that time -- or sorry,
- 10 strike that.
- 11 After that time period, B&W declared incremental
- 12 profits directly to B.A.T. Industries; isn't that
- 13 true?
- 14 A. Could you please clarify. I'm not sure what you
- 15 mean by "incremental profits."
- 16 Q. Well during the -- strike that.
- 17 In the time period after April of 1990, Brown &
- 18 Williamson declared profits directly to B.A.T.
- 19 Industries; right?
- 20 MS. McGARRY: Objection, assumes facts not
- 21 in evidence. You may answer.
- 22 A. "Declared profits" is -- is a -- a -- an
- 23 expression with -- with which I'm not familiar.
- 24 Profit is profit. Profit is a -- a -- a conclusion
- 25 reached from the application of accounting

- 1 principles. It's -- in basic terms, it is the
- 2 product of gross revenue minus expenditure, and that
- 3 is usually what results in profits. So profit is, as
- 4 I say, the conclusion from those factors.
- 5 If you are referring to or suggesting that in
- 6 some way B&W declared a dividend directly to B.A.T.
- 7 Industries, I think that cannot be the case because
- 8 the parent company of Brown & Williamson after 1990
- 9 was a company called BATUS Tobacco Services Inc. and
- 10 the parent company of BATUS Tobacco Services Inc. was
- 11 BATUS Holdings, and I -- I cannot see how Brown &
- 12 Williamson could have paid a dividend directly to
- 13 B.A.T. Industries.
- 14 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 647 was marked
- for identification.)
- 16 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 17 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 18 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 647, this is a document which
- 19 begins with the Bates number 500038508; right?
- 20 A. Correct.
- 21 Q. It is a document headed "SECRET, MINUTES OF
- 22 MEETING, MILLBANK WEDNESDAY 2ND OCTOBER 1991, FAR
- 23 EAST RE-ORGANISATION"; right?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 Q. Would you take a look at point number four and

- 1 read it to yourself.
- 2 (Witness reviews Plaintiffs' Exhibit 647.)
- 3 A. I'm going to ask you, please, to let me read the
- 4 whole document. I'm not going to answer questions on
- 5 one paragraph out of a context which I'm not aware
- 6 of. I haven't seen this document before.
- 7 Q. All right, go ahead.
- 8 (Witness continues reviewing Plaintiffs'
- 9 Exhibit 647.)
- 10 Q. Sir, you've now taken the time to read
- 11 Exhibit 647.
- 12 A. Yes, I have, yes.
- 13 Q. All right. This document concerns a meeting at
- 14 which five individuals were present; right?
- 15 A. Five individuals are recorded as having been
- 16 present, yes.
- 17 Q. The first is Mr. Bramley?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And for whom does he work?
- 20 A. In 1991 Mr. Bramley was the chairman and
- 21 essentially chief executive of British-American
- 22 Tobacco Company, BATCO, and he was also a member of
- 23 the board of B.A.T. Industries.
- 24 Q. And another person who was present at this
- 25 meeting was Mr. Adams.

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. At the time of the meeting, what position did
- 3 Mr. Adams have?
- 4 A. Mr. Adams was a director of BATCO.
- 5 Q. And also present was Mr. Cunningham; right?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. What position did he have at the time?
- 8 A. I do not know. It's not a name I'm familiar
- 9 with at all.
- 10 Q. Also present was Mr. Hardman.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. What position did he have at the time?
- 13 A. I believe at that time Mr. Hardman was the tax
- 14 manager for BATCO, I believe, but I -- I'm not
- 15 absolutely convinced. I think he was.
- 16 Q. And finally present was Mr. Leach; right?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. What position did he have at the time?
- 19 A. Again it's not a name I'm at all familiar with.
- 20 Q. Now it says in the first paragraph that "The
- 21 purpose of the meeting was a debriefing following the
- 22 presentation to Sir Patrick Sheehy by BDB/PA of the
- 23 proposed Far East re-organisation"; right?
- 24 A. Yes, that's what it says.
- 25 Q. To what does "the Far East re-organisation"

- 1 mean, refer?
- 2 A. I don't know what it means in this context, I'm
- 3 sorry.
- 4 Q. There is reference here at point four that "It
- 5 was agreed that B & W should invoice product through
- 6 the Far East Unit of BATUKE but incremental profits
- 7 should be declared directly up to BAT Industries";
- 8 correct?
- 9 A. That is what paragraph four says, yes.
- 10 Q. Sir, were any of the individuals listed at this
- 11 meeting Brown & Williamson employees?
- 12 A. Well I have previously testified that I do not
- 13 know who Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Leach are, so -- but
- 14 $\,$ I -- so $\,$ I have no knowledge as to whom these people
- 15 are, and I have also testified the associations of
- 16 Mr. Bramley, Mr. Adams and Mr. Hardman.
- 17 Q. Sir, are you aware of the discussions to which
- 18 this document refers?
- 19 A. No, I'm not aware of the discussions to which
- 20 this document refers.
- 21 Q. Do you have in -- any information that point
- 22 number four -- strike that.
- 23 Well did Brown & Williamson invoice product
- 24 through the Far East Unit of BATUKE and then declare
- 25 profits directly to B.A.T. Industries?

- 1 A. I do not know whether Brown & Williamson
- 2 invoiced product through the Far East Unit of
- 3 BATUKE. I am -- as I've said before, the only way in
- 4 which I can understand that Brown & Williamson could
- 5 make payments to B.A.T. Industries is by way of a
- 6 dividend declared to Brown & Williamson's parent
- 7 company, and if Brown & Williamson's parent company
- 8 should then decide to pay a dividend to its parent
- 9 company, who in turn should decide to pay a dividend
- 10 to B.A.T. Industries, that would be the way things
- 11 would be done. And that is in fact the only way, as
- 12 I understand it, things can be done.
- So I am not aware of any incremental profits,
- 14 whatever that phrase should mean, being declared
- 15 directly up to B.A.T. Industries, and it does in fact
- 16 use the word "declared directly," which to me doesn't
- 17 have any particular meaning. It doesn't say profits
- 18 would be paid to B.A.T. Industries. It says "should
- 19 be declared directly up to BAT Industries." It's
- 20 ambiguous, unclear, and I simply do not know what it
- 21 means.
- 22 And I also want to make the point that this --
- 23 this is a -- purports to be a minutes of a meeting
- 24 held at Millbank in October 1991. Millbank is the
- 25 headquarters building of -- or was the headquarters

- 1 building of BATCO, and I've -- and I've identified at
- 2 least three of the individuals present at the meeting
- 3 as being employees, representatives of BATCO.
- 4 Q. If you --
- 5 MS. McGARRY: Martha, can I ask if you have
- 6 a lot more. We have -- we've hit ten hours by my
- 7 records. I'm not going to be a stickler if you've
- 8 got a few minutes, but --
- 9 MS. WIVELL: Well not --
- 10 MS. McGARRY: -- just according to what's
- 11 on the screen.
- MS. WIVELL: What's on the screen of course
- 13 includes colloquy, so it's my understanding that at
- 14 lunchtime we were -- we were approximately eight
- 15 hours.
- 16 THE REPORTER: Can we go off the record?
- MS. WIVELL: Yes.
- THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 19 (Recess taken.)
- 20 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 21 Q. Sir, B.A.T. Industries required Brown &
- 22 Williamson to provide it with financial projections,
- 23 didn't it?
- MS. McGARRY: Object to the form. You may
- 25 answer.

- 1 A. I gave some testimony yesterday that it is the
- 2 practice of B.A.T. Industries to issue what are
- 3 called guidelines to its operating companies, its
- 4 major operating companies, and I also gave testimony
- 5 that the purpose of these guidelines is essentially
- 6 to provoke, if you like, a discussion with the
- 7 relevant operating group about its projected
- 8 performance, its plans for the forthcoming period,
- 9 and I said that the guidelines led to a document
- 10 which was called a preview and which is presented to
- 11 B.A.T. Industries and which itself is then discussed
- 12 with B.A.T. Industries and that following those
- 13 discussions, which are, I think I said yesterday, in
- 14 the form of a negotiation as much as anything else,
- 15 the relevant operating company then goes back and
- 16 produces a company plan based on those discussions
- 17 and that in the past the company plans have been
- 18 five, sometimes I think more recently three years,
- 19 possibly even ten-year plans at one stage, but
- 20 certainly five- and more recently three-year plans,
- 21 and that those plans are then combined to produce
- 22 a -- an overall plan, which is presented to the board
- 23 of B.A.T. Industries and which B.A.T. Industries will
- 24 either endorse or not endorse and hopefully will
- 25 endorse.

- 1 And I think in that context I think that's the
- 2 answer to the question you're -- you've raised.
- 3 MS. McGARRY: Thank you.
- 4 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 648 was marked
- for identification.)
- 6 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 7 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 8 Exhibit 648, this is a document which begins with
- 9 Bates number 201761526; right?
- 10 A. Yes, it does, yes.
- 11 Q. Exhibit 648 is "B.A.T Industries' Guidelines:
- 12 July 1992," which it sent to Brown & Williamson;
- 13 correct?
- 14 A. That appears to be the case, yes.
- 15 Q. Now this is an example of the guidelines that
- 16 you were referring to in your answer above; right?
- 17 A. Yes, I believe this would be an example of the
- 18 guidelines, yes.
- 19 Q. All right. Now --
- 20 A. I -- sorry, I hadn't actually quite completed --
- 21 I'm sorry about that, if I misled you. I hadn't
- 22 actually completed my answer. I say I believe this
- 23 would be an example of those guidelines. The
- 24 document itself predates my appointment as the
- 25 secretary to the company, and therefore I didn't

- 1 have -- wouldn't have specific knowledge of this
- 2 particular document, but I think your conclusion is
- 3 probably fair.
- 4 Q. All right. It says here "The attached
- 5 Guidelines" out -- "outline the strategic priorities
- 6 and financial" object -- "objectives which have been
- 7 agreed for Brown & Williamson ... "; right?
- 8 A. That is what it says, yes.
- 9 Q. All right. Let me understand the process.
- 10 Were these guidelines agreed with Brown &
- 11 Williamson or were they established for Brown &
- 12 Williamson?
- 13 A. I -- I can only answer from what the document
- 14 says. The document does indicate a degree of a
- 15 consensual approach. It does talk about agreement,
- 16 but I -- I can only say what the words of the
- 17 document actually say.
- 18 The -- the usual process, as I think I mentioned
- 19 earlier, was that B.A.T. Industries would produce
- 20 guidelines, which would then be submitted to the
- 21 operating companies. I don't for one minute suppose
- 22 those guidelines are produced in isolation from the
- 23 operating company. It would be somewhat artificial
- 24 if the holding company simply dreamt up its own
- 25 guidelines and presented them as a -- you know, to

- 1 the operations without any previous discussion or
- 2 communication.
- 3 Q. It --
- 4 A. I -- I don't know.
- 5 Q. I'm sorry.
- 6 It refers to B.A.T.'s own objectives, doesn't
- 7 it, sir?
- 8 A. It says at paragraph one "The guidelines are
- 9 consistent with B.A.T Industries' own objectives to,"
- 10 and then it specifies some objectives.
- 11 May I say if you're going to ask me questions on
- 12 this document, which I have not previously seen, I
- 13 would like to read -- read the document. I think
- 14 it's only a page and a half.
- 15 Q. All right. Well let me just ask you one more
- 16 question that is unrelated to the document first of
- 17 all.
- 18 Before this kind of guideline is sent to Brown &
- 19 Williamson, these objectives that are referred to are
- 20 established by B.A.T. Industries; isn't that true?
- 21 A. B.A.T. Industries would have objectives, have
- 22 its own objectives as a -- as a company. It has a
- 23 board of directors who meet to discuss strategy and
- 24 where the company believes it's in the best interests
- 25 of its shareholders to invest its -- it's public

- 1 stockholders, sorry, explain the term for you --
- 2 where it's best to invest the money of its public
- 3 stockholders and which types of investments.
- 4 Of course any company has its own guidelines,
- 5 its own strategies, its own -- its own -- its own way
- 6 of looking at things.
- 7 Q. So would it be fair to say that the B.A.T.
- 8 objectives are those which it has established in
- 9 order to provide the best return for its
- 10 shareholders?
- 11 A. I think the only way I can answer that is to say
- 12 I think it would be highly unlikely that B.A.T.
- 13 Industries would produce its own -- would produce
- 14 objectives for itself which were not developed on the
- 15 basis of im -- of achieving the best returns for its
- 16 shareholders.
- 17 Q. All right. Why don't you take a moment and read
- 18 the document, and then we'll talk about it.
- 19 (Witness reviews Plaintiffs' Exhibit 648.)
- 20 Q. You've read the document, sir?
- 21 A. Yes, I have.
- 22 Q. Now, the guidelines that we were talking about
- 23 earlier that B.A.T. established are listed as -- as
- 24 points (a) and (b); right?
- 25 A. Sorry, can you just read back the question to

- 1 me.
- 2 Q. Certainly.
- 3 A. I don't think I understood that.
- 4 Q. The guidelines that we were talking about just a
- 5 moment or two ago that B.A.T. established are listed
- 6 at points (a) and (b) on the first page.
- 7 A. You're talking about the guidelines B.A.T.
- 8 established for itself?
- 9 Q. Fair enough. Bad question.
- 10 A. No, I'm -- I'm sorry, I'm -- yes.
- 11 Q. No, no, you've made a valid point, and I'm going
- 12 to withdraw the question and rephrase it.
- 13 The document concerns B.A.T. Industries'
- 14 guidelines overall which it established for Brown &
- 15 Williamson; right?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 17 A. No. In fact, what this document is -- I'm glad
- 18 you've raised the question because I think I can help
- 19 you. What this document is is a document which
- 20 provides merely an introduction to the 1992
- 21 guidelines which B.A.T. Industries submitted to
- 22 Brown & Williamson. In fact, it says in the first
- 23 paragraph "The attached Guidelines" What the
- 24 document goes on to say is that the attached -- "The
- 25 guidelines"; i.e., the attached guidelines -- that

- 1 must be a reference to the attached guidelines --
- 2 "are consistent with B.A.T Industries' own
- 3 objectives"; i.e., the objectives of B.A.T.
- 4 Industries.
- 5 The objectives which the board of B.A.T.
- 6 Industries presumably has set for itself, set for
- 7 B.A.T. Industries, are not inconsistent with the
- 8 guidelines for Brown & Williamson which are attached
- 9 to this -- or which the document says are attached to
- 10 this document, but which are in fact not included as
- 11 part of the exhibit.
- 12 Q. So this actually --
- Exhibit 648 is not actually the guidelines. It
- 14 was just the cover letter that was sent along with
- 15 the guidelines; is that right?
- 16 A. This document, from its face, does not appear to
- 17 be the guidelines to Brown & Williamson because it
- 18 says in the very first paragraph "The attached
- 19 Guidelines " In other words, there appears to be
- 20 or there appears -- it appears to me there should
- 21 have been an attachment to this document, but that
- 22 attachment, as I say, is not included as part of your
- 23 Exhibit 648, which contains only two pages, having
- 24 the Bates numbers 201761526 and 201761527.
- 25 Q. Exhibit 648 was a cover memo which set out

- 1 generally B.A.T.'s own objectives; would that be fair
- 2 to say?
- 3 A. I don't want to give a characterization to -- to
- 4 the documentation beyond what it actually says, but
- 5 it certainly does indicate what B.A.T. Industries'
- 6 own objectives for B.A.T. Industries were or
- 7 certainly what some of them were at any rate, I
- 8 think, by the reference in section on paragraph one
- 9 to paragraphs (a) and (b).
- 10 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 649 was marked
- for identification.)
- 12 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 13 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 14 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 649, the first page begins with
- 15 Bates number 191002374; correct?
- 16 A. Yes, it does.
- 17 O. And this is a letter from Ulrich Herter to
- 18 Mr. Sandefur entitled "GUIDELINES FOR BROWN &
- 19 WILLIAMSON 1994"; right?
- 20 A. This -- well it's -- it's not signed by
- 21 Mr. Herter, but it looks as though it could be a copy
- 22 of a letter from Mr. Herter to Mr. Sandefur bearing
- 23 that date, yes.
- 24 Q. All right. Who was --
- Who is Mr. Herter?

- 1 A. Mr. Herter is a member of the board of B.A.T.
- 2 Industries and he is also at the present time the
- 3 managing director of British-American Tobacco
- 4 Holdings Limited, the company which I explained, I
- 5 think, earlier is the company formerly known as
- 6 Staines Investments Limited, which was incorporated
- 7 in 1932.
- 8 Q. All right. And which took over the general
- 9 operations of the tobacco group businesses within
- 10 B.A.T. Industries as of approximately January 1st,
- 11 1996; right?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, misstates the
- 13 prior testimony.
- 14 A. Thank you. In fact, with respect, I would have
- 15 said that that is a misstatement. I didn't say it
- 16 took over the -- the responsibility, the
- 17 management of the operations. I think my testimony
- 18 was that it -- it took over strategic -- it took over
- 19 responsibility for the strategic direction of
- 20 achieving the vision of regaining the number-one
- 21 position as the -- in the tobacco business.
- 22 Q. Now, sir, attached to this document,
- 23 Exhibit 649, are guidelines for Brown & Williamson,
- 24 July 1994; correct?
- 25 A. Yes. That appears to be the case, yes.

- 1 Q. All right. Would you take a moment and read
- 2 that document over.
- 3 A. Okay.
- 4 (Witness reviews Plaintiffs' Exhibit 649.)
- 5 A. Can I -- I'm still reading the document. Can I
- 6 just make a point that there are some sections of
- 7 this document that I in fact cannot read at all;
- 8 they're illegible. On page two of the guidelines,
- 9 paragraph eight, I cannot read the second sentence at
- 10 all.
- 11 Q. Sir, I promise you since I can't read them
- 12 either, I won't be asking you about them.
- 13 A. That's -- thank you.
- 14 (Witness continues reviewing Plaintiffs'
- 15 Exhibit 649.)
- 16 Q. Sir, you've now read the document; right?
- 17 A. Yes, I have.
- 18 Q. B.A.T. Industries established certain priorities
- 19 that are set forth in the guidelines that begin on
- 20 the second page of Exhibit 649.
- MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 22 A. I think the document says what the document
- 23 says. I -- it says at paragraph one "The first
- 24 priority for Brown & Williamson is to assist B.A.T
- 25 Industries, " et cetera.

- 1 Q. And it goes on to say "... in its objective to
- 2 be the premier Tobacco company"; correct?
- 3 A. It does say that.
- 4 Q. All right.
- 5 A. It also goes on to say "This will be achieved by
- 6 growing profitable volume and value share in the end
- 7 markets for which it is responsible" -- I think
- 8 that's a reference to Brown & Williamson -- "and in
- 9 particular, growing share of premium/high price
- 10 segment International Brands."
- 11 Q. So it would be correct to say that the first
- 12 priority that was established by B.A.T. Industries
- 13 for Brown & Williamson was to assist B.A.T.
- 14 Industries in its objective to be the premier tobacco
- 15 company; correct?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection. Sorry.
- 17 Objection, mischaracterizes the document and the
- 18 witness's prior testimony concerning guidelines.
- 19 A. Could you read the question back to me. I beg
- 20 your pardon.
- 21 Q. Yes. It would be correct to say that the first
- 22 priority that was established by B.A.T. Industries
- 23 for Brown & Williamson was to assist -- I'm sorry,
- 24 strike that.
- 25 It would be correct to say that the first

- 1 priority that was established by B.A.T. Industries
- 2 was for Brown & Williamson to assist B.A.T.
- 3 Industries in its objective to be the premier tobacco
- 4 company; correct?
- 5 MS. McGARRY: Same objections.
- 6 A. I -- it cannot -- it cannot be the case that it
- 7 was intended to make B.A.T. Industries the -- B.A.T.
- 8 Industries P.L.C. the premier tobacco company because
- 9 I've already testified -- and I think I've testified
- 10 to this on more occasions than I can now remember --
- 11 that B.A.T. Industries itself is not a tobacco
- 12 company. B.A.T. Industries is an investment holding
- 13 company that holds shares in companies that
- 14 manufacture and market tobacco products.
- 15 And I think the reference is intended to mean --
- 16 in fact, I am sure the reference is intended to mean
- 17 that the group of companies in the tobacco business
- 18 in which B.A.T. Industries invests collectively will
- 19 become the premier tobacco company, and that is --
- 20 that is in fact consistent with the testimony I gave
- 21 this morning concerning the vision to regain the
- 22 number-one position, which was one of the driving
- 23 forces in connection with Project Battalion and with
- 24 the reconstitution of the board of British-American
- 25 Tobacco Holdings as a body charged with strategic

- 1 responsibility for seeing through that vision.
- 2 Q. Sir, the document was written by a B.A.T.
- 3 Industries' employee, wasn't it, sir?
- 4 MS. McGARRY: Objection, inconsistent with
- 5 the prior testimony.
- 6 MS. WIVELL: Well let me rephrase it.
- 7 Q. This document was sent by a member of the board
- 8 of B.A.T. Industries to Tom Sandefur, chairman of
- 9 Brown & Williamson, wasn't it, sir?
- 10 A. This document appears --
- 11 As I said earlier, this thing is not signed, but
- 12 I have no reason to doubt that this document was
- 13 authored by someone at B.A.T. Industries and that it
- 14 was sent by B.A.T. Industries to Mr. Sandefur, who
- 15 was at that time the chairman of Brown & Williamson
- 16 Tobacco Corporation.
- 17 O. And --
- And in fact, sir, at the top of the page we've
- 19 just been looking at, it shows that this document was
- 20 faxed from B.A.T. Finance on August 8th, 1994; isn't
- 21 that true, sir?
- 22 A. It looks like the sort of heading one gets from
- 23 a fax machine. I can't confirm or deny it, but it
- 24 certainly looks like that.
- 25 And -- and while I'm answering that question,

- 1 I'd just like to go -- go back because, although you
- 2 hadn't appreciated it, I hadn't actually finished my
- 3 previous answer. I wanted to make the point in
- 4 connection with the document that, as is quite clear
- 5 from the document, from the guidelines and
- 6 particularly I think from Mr. Herter's letter to
- 7 Tommy Sandefur, this was -- these -- these are in
- 8 fact revised guidelines and -- and clearly there had
- 9 been discussions between Mr. Sandefur and, I imagine,
- 10 Mr. Herter because it talks about "As you are aware
- 11 the draft Guidelines recently sent to you included a
- 12 revised 8 percent Trading Profit Growth Target." And
- 13 he's now saying, "I attached a revised version which
- 14 reflects further changes in guidelines" and in fact
- 15 says that the operating cash surplus growth target
- 16 will in fact be reduced. So whereas before the
- 17 quideline had suggested that Brown & Williamson
- 18 should -- should produce, say, operating cash surplus
- 19 growth target -- or should achieve an operating
- 20 cash -- cash surplus growth target of 12 percent,
- 21 this was being revised downwards to 10 percent. And
- 22 the document also reflects that the previous
- 23 guideline of a growth in net turnover of 6 percent
- 24 was now being reduced down to 5 percent.
- 25 And I think it's quite consistent with

- 1 discussions having taken place between Mr. Sandefur
- 2 and Mr. Herter in the spirit of discussions which I
- 3 think I've testified to is the usual way these things
- 4 are done.
- 5 Q. Sir, have you ever talked to Mr. Herter about
- 6 this document?
- 7 A. I have not talked to Mr. Herter about this
- 8 document, no.
- 9 Q. Have you talked to Mr. Sandefur about this
- 10 document?
- 11 A. I have not talked to Mr. Sandefur about this
- 12 document. I think you may know Mr. Sandefur is now
- 13 deceased.
- 14 Q. Yes, I understand that. Have you talked to
- 15 anyone about this document, sir?
- 16 A. Yes, I believe I have talked to someone about
- 17 this document.
- 18 Q. Who was that?
- 19 A. I believe I spoke to Hilary Barton about this
- 20 document.
- 21 Q. Hilary Barton authored this document, didn't
- 22 she, sir?
- 23 A. I am not entirely sure that Hilary Barton
- 24 authored this document, but the document bears at the
- 25 end of the document on page three; that is, the page

- 1 with the Bates number 191002377, the initials
- 2 "HCB/DWS," and "HCB" I take to be a reference to
- 3 Hilary Barton.
- 4 Q. Now, sir, what this document says clearly is,
- 5 quote, "The first priority for Brown & Williamson is
- 6 to assist B.A.T Industries in its objective to be the
- 7 premier Tobacco company, doesn't it, sir?
- 8 A. I have testified already that that is what the
- 9 document says, but that is not what the document
- 10 meant in my understanding.
- 11 Q. Sir, considering that you neither talked to
- 12 Mr. Herter nor Mr. Sandefur about this document,
- 13 wouldn't you agree that you truly do not know what
- 14 went on between them at the time this document was
- 15 sent?
- 16 MS. McGARRY: Then why are you asking the
- 17 witness questions about a document if you don't
- 18 accept his interpretation of it? We will stipulate
- 19 that the first sentence of paragraph one was
- 20 correctly read by you.
- 21 Q. Do you have my question in mind, sir?
- 22 A. I'm sorry, could you repeat your question,
- 23 please.
- 24 Q. Yes. Considering that you neither talked to
- 25 Mr. Herter or to Mr. Sandefurd about this document,

- 1 wouldn't you agree that you truly do not know what
- 2 went on between them at the time this document was
- 3 sent?
- 4 A. I have no knowledge of what conversations were
- 5 held between Mr. Herter and Mr. Sandefur other than
- 6 is as is recorded in the doc -- in these documents.
- 7 Q. Now, sir, if we turn --
- 8 MS. McGARRY: It's Sandefur, by the way.
- 9 THE WITNESS: Sorry?
- 10 MS. McGARRY: I said "Sandefur, by the
- 11 way, " not Sandefurd.
- 12 Q. Sir, if we turn to the page that ends with Bates
- 13 number 376, we see additional specific priorities
- 14 which have been set out; correct?
- 15 A. I see a heading which says "Specific
- 16 Priorities."
- 17 Q. These specific priorities would have been
- 18 established by B.A.T. Industries for Brown &
- 19 Williamson; isn't that true, sir?
- 20 MS. McGARRY: Objection, mischaracterizes
- 21 the witness's prior testimony about guidelines.
- 22 A. I've given testimony I think again on this
- 23 subject of guidelines more times than I can now
- 24 remember, but I have already said that the -- this
- 25 guideline is not a definitive objective. What a

- 1 guideline is, it is a proposal from the holding
- 2 company, the company that holds the investment, to
- 3 the operating company as to what the holding company
- 4 anticipates by way of performance from the operating
- 5 company, and it is a document which is intended to
- 6 provoke discussion, debate between the operating
- 7 company and the holding company. And I cannot add
- 8 any more to that answer.
- 9 Q. Now, sir, the specific priorities that are set
- 10 out here include one on smoking issues; correct?
- 11 A. Specific priorities 15, smoking issues.
- 12 Q. And it says "Brown & Williamson should work with
- 13 the rest of the US Tobacco industry to put across its
- 14 message and so achieve a more balanced public
- 15 perception"; correct?
- 16 A. That is what the document says.
- 17 Q. And, sir, that refers to getting across the
- 18 message that was established in the board policy on
- 19 smoking and health that we discussed earlier in this
- 20 deposition; isn't that true?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 22 A. I'm sorry, could you read back the question,
- 23 please.
- 24 Q. Sir, that refers to getting across the message
- 25 that was established in the board policy on smoking

- 1 and health that we discussed earlier in this
- 2 deposition; isn't that true?
- 3 A. I'm -- I don't really follow the question
- 4 because the -- the -- the board policy, if -- if --
- 5 by which if you're referring to the policy on legal
- 6 considerations of smoking and health, doesn't convey
- 7 a message as such. What it does is to convey the
- 8 position of the -- of B.A.T. Industries, of the -- of
- 9 the group, on the issue of causation. Essentially
- 10 that is what the document deals with, so I'm not sure
- 11 how this can be a reference to that, but frankly I
- 12 can't speculate as to what this reference is a
- 13 reference to. It's unclear to me. The document says
- 14 really what the document says.
- 15 Q. Now, sir, the next priority that is set forth
- 16 concerns the Kool brand of cigarettes; right?
- 17 A. That is right.
- 18 Q. And the estab -- the -- I'm sorry, strike that.
- 19 The priority that was listed there was "... to
- 20 switch the marketing focus of Kool to its franchise
- 21 and stabilize its share of the full revenue menthol
- 22 segment, so that its major contribution to profits
- 23 continues, to gain time to develop the profitability
- 24 of other brands, either new full revenue brands or
- 25 increased profit in VFM"; right?

- 1 A. I -- I think that's right. Yes, I mean, yes, I
- 2 think you've read what it says. Yes, I think that's
- 3 right, yes.
- 4 Q. And isn't it a fact that this priority -- or by
- 5 this priority B.A.T. Industries is directing the
- 6 marketing focus of the Kool franchise of Brown &
- 7 Williamson?
- 8 MS. McGARRY: Objection, mischaracterizes
- 9 the witness's prior testimony on the document.
- 10 A. I think I testified in response to a question,
- 11 perhaps the last question or the question before
- 12 that, that the purpose of the guidelines is to
- 13 provoke a discussion, a debate with the operating
- 14 group about the performance of the operating group
- 15 for the forthcoming period. It is not a direction.
- 16 It doesn't mandate an operating group to do
- 17 anything.
- 18 It is simply intended to set out what B.A.T.
- 19 Industries as the company owning the investment
- 20 anticipates the operating company in question might
- 21 be able to achieve and is intended that the operating
- 22 company will enter into discussions with the parent
- 23 company to discuss its projected performance.
- 24 Q. Now, am I correct in understanding that as --
- 25 after the guidelines were sent to Brown & Williamson,

- 1 Brown & Williamson would have developed a document
- 2 called a preview?
- 3 A. That would normally be the situation, yes.
- 4 Q. And then the preview would be sent back to
- 5 B.A.T. Industries for its review and approval or
- 6 disapproval; correct?
- 7 A. No, that's something of an abbreviation of what
- 8 actually happens. What happens is that the
- 9 guidelines, as I say, are sent to the operating
- 10 group. They are discussed. The operating group then
- 11 presents a preview, essentially a preview of its
- 12 plan, which is then considered at B.A.T. Industries,
- 13 and meetings are held between representatives of
- 14 B.A.T. Industries and the operating group at which
- 15 the preview is -- is discussed.
- 16 And following those discussions, the operating
- 17 group goes back and then produces a company plan
- 18 based on all those discussions and negotiations.
- 19 It's a sort of two-way process, if you like. It's --
- 20 you know, I think I mentioned earlier the consensual
- 21 approach, and this is really what this is -- this is
- 22 all about.
- 23 Q. But you would agree that in this process the
- 24 folks at B.A.T. Industries have a right to tell the
- 25 operating company; in this case, Brown & Williamson,

- 1 "No, we don't agree with that. We want you to do it
- 2 this way"; right?
- 3 A. I think we need to be a bit more precise about
- 4 this. I've given, I think, quite considerable
- 5 testimony now which is to the effect that the holding
- 6 company, which is an investment company which owns
- 7 securities, owns the shares, the stock of operating
- 8 companies, does not give instructions to those
- 9 operating companies about the way in which those
- 10 companies carry on their day-to-day management, and
- 11 the reason for that is really quite simple.
- 12 While there are some people in the investment --
- 13 the investment holding company, in B.A.T. Industries,
- 14 who understand these businesses, a company which has
- 15 an employee force consisting of approximately a
- 16 hundred people cannot possibly manage the day-to-day
- 17 activities of its various operating companies around
- 18 the world, which number several hundred. It cannot
- 19 possibly make the thousands of daily operating
- 20 decisions which need to be made by any company in a
- 21 substantial way of business.
- 22 So I would dispute that the day-to-day
- 23 management decisions are directed by B.A.T.
- 24 Industries, but I would entirely agree that strategic
- 25 issues -- and one of these I have previously

- 1 identified as the desire to make the tobacco
- 2 operations of B.A.T. Industries or the -- the
- 3 operations of the subsidiaries -- of the tobacco
- 4 subsidiaries of B.A.T. -- of B.A.T. Industries
- 5 collectively the number-one tobacco business in the
- 6 world -- these are clearly matters which are
- 7 appropriate for a holding -- a holding company to be
- 8 involved in and to even give some direction on.
- 9 THE WITNESS: Could -- could we please take
- 10 a -- a break at this stage?
- 11 MS. WIVELL: Certainly.
- 12 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- 13 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 14 (Recess taken.)
- 15 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 650 was marked
- for identification.)
- 17 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 18 Q. Sir, you've had the opportunity to review
- 19 Exhibit 650?
- 20 A. Yes, I have.
- 21 Q. That is a document that begins with the Bates
- 22 number 201787454; right?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- 24 Q. And this document concerns a meeting that was
- 25 held with the Chairman's Policy Committee of B.A.T.

- 1 Industries and Mr. Pritchard of Brown & Williamson to
- 2 discuss the preview of Brown & Williamson's plan for
- 3 the years 1992 through 1996; right?
- 4 A. Yes, it was a meeting between the CEC -- sorry,
- 5 CPC, Chairman's Policy Committee, and Mr. Pritchard,
- 6 well between two members of the Chairman's Policy
- 7 Committee. You'll see that Mr. Garraway, as the
- 8 minutes indicate, was unable to be present, but
- 9 Mr. Pritchard from Brown & Williamson was there
- 10 according to this minute.
- 11 Q. And the, quote, unquote, "Preview" that's
- 12 referred to in the first line of the document is the
- 13 preview that you've been discussing in your previous
- 14 answers?
- 15 A. I think that's a reasonable assumption, yes.
- 16 Q. All right. Now if we go down to point nine, it
- 17 reflects that "The CPC was not convinced that the
- 18 strategies proposed would give the optimum result for
- 19 the company," and it asked Brown & Williamson to do
- 20 certain things, didn't it?
- 21 A. Yes, that's correct. That's what the -- the
- 22 minute says, yes.
- 23 Q. All right. And the CPC asked Brown & Williamson
- 24 to provide an -- an analysis covering at least the
- 25 past three years for Kool showing the effect of

- 1 increased marketing expenditure on market share;
- 2 right?
- 3 A. Yes, that's what it says.
- 4 Q. And the CPC also asked Brown & Williamson to
- 5 prepare alternative strategies involving
- 6 significantly lower levels of marketing expenditure;
- 7 right?
- 8 A. Paragraph 9(b) says that, and if I may go on,
- 9 paragraph 14 summarizing the position, therefore
- 10 summarizing the meeting, says, if I may quote, "The"
- 12 wished to discuss possible alternatives" -- I stress
- 13 the words "wished to discuss possible
- 14 alternatives" -- "which might" -- and I stress the
- 15 word "might" -- "which might include a milking
- 16 strategy and should certainly include a strategy
- 17 involving a significantly lower expenditure on
- 18 support for Kool."
- 19 The CPC wished to discuss possible
- 20 alternatives. I've referred in testimony on numerous
- 21 occasions to the process by which corporate plans are
- 22 produced, which essentially arises out of a
- 23 consensual process, a series of discussions which
- 24 take place between the holding company and between
- 25 the operations. And I've also mentioned the process

- 1 by which guidelines are sent by B.A.T. Industries to
- 2 its operating companies, the process by which those
- 3 guidelines are then -- or then lead to the production
- 4 of a preview, which is then discussed between the
- 5 operating company and the CEC or, as it was in 1991,
- 6 the Chairman's Policy Committee.
- 7 And I think the minute 14 of these minutes, to
- 8 which I have referred, demonstrates quite properly
- 9 that the CEC wished to discuss or wished to
- 10 consider -- wished to discuss -- in fact, wished to
- 11 discuss with Brown & Williamson possible alternative
- 12 strategies. The CEC was not imposing any strategy on
- 13 Brown & Williamson. It was inviting Brown &
- 14 Williamson to propose alternatives for discussion.
- 15 Q. Well, sir, you left out a full sentence of that
- 16 summary, didn't you? That sentence says
- 17 "Summarising, the Chairman said that while they
- 18 appreciated the problems facing Brown & Williamson,
- 19 the CPC could not accept the preview without further
- 20 justification of the strategies." That's what it
- 21 says; isn't that true, sir?
- 22 A. The sentence says that, and the reason I left it
- 23 out was because it adds in fact nothing to the
- 24 previous answer I have given. "... the CPC could not
- 25 accept the preview without further justification of

- 1 the strategies"; in other words, "Brown & Williamson,
- 2 would you please provide some further justification
- 3 for the strategies which you are proposing." And --
- 4 Q. And then it --
- 5 A. -- it doesn't say anything -- if I may continue
- 6 my answer, it doesn't say that the CPC is rejecting
- 7 the preview. It is simply asking for further
- 8 explanation, and that is what the document says and I
- 9 can't say any more than that.
- 10 Q. Because you haven't talked to anyone who
- 11 participated in this meeting about the document, can
- 12 you?
- 13 A. I haven't -- sorry, can you just read that back
- 14 to me, please.
- 15 Q. Sure. You have not talked to anyone who
- 16 participated in this meeting about this document?
- 17 A. I have had no discussion with those who are
- 18 listed as present at that particular meeting about
- 19 the discussions which took place and which are the
- 20 subject of this particular set of minutes, no.
- 21 Q. Now, in the next sentence of item 14 it says
- 22 "The CPC also wished to discuss possible
- 23 alternatives" that "might include a milking
- 24 strategy " What do you understand a milking
- 25 strategy to be?

- 1 A. I do not understand a -- what a milking -- I --
- 2 let me put it like this: I do not know precisely
- 3 what is meant by "a milking strategy" there. I --
- 4 yeah, I -- I just don't know what it means in that
- 5 context.
- 6 Q. Now if we go on to the next note, point 15, it
- 7 says "The CPC would also be looking for better
- 8 substantiation of the forecast for exports and ... a
- 9 continuing commitment to strengthen the management in
- 10 order to be able to realise the full potential of the
- 11 strong portfolio of brands"; correct, sir?
- 12 A. Yes, that's what it says, yes.
- 13 Q. All right. And, sir, have you talked to anyone
- 14 about the meaning of that paragraph?
- 15 A. While I have not talked to anybody about the
- 16 meaning of that par -- if I may finish my answer,
- 17 please.
- I have not talked to anybody -- while I have not
- 19 talked to anybody about the meaning of that
- 20 paragraph, the paragraph appears to me to speak for
- 21 itself. It asks the CEC -- or the CPC is asking
- 22 again for further substantiation of the forecastable
- 23 exports. Brown & Williamson manufactures and markets
- 24 tobacco products in the United States of America and
- 25 also exports its products overseas, and it is asking

- 1 for further clarification of the forecasts in
- 2 connection with Brown & Williamson's export
- 3 business.
- 4 And the next part of the paragraph, which is
- 5 talking about a continuing commitment to strengthen
- 6 the management in -- in order to be able to realize
- 7 the full potential of the strong portfolio of brands,
- 8 is an entirely appropriate commitment for an
- 9 investment holding company to seek from the
- 10 management of one of its major operating businesses.
- 11 This is one of the functions of an investment holding
- 12 company, to ensure that there is proper management in
- 13 place to conduct the management of its business -- of
- 14 the businesses which it owns so that they continue to
- 15 be profitable, and that is simply what the -- what
- 16 the paragraph is referring to.
- 17 Q. Move to strike the nonresponsive portions of the
- 18 answer.
- 19 Sir, what is an EIP plan?
- 20 A. Sorry, what is a --
- 21 Q. EIP plan.
- 22 A. I believe the expression "EIP" refers to
- 23 "executive -- executive incentive plan."
- 24 Q. All right. B.A.T. Industries approves the
- 25 executive incentive plan for Brown & Williamson,

- 1 doesn't it?
- 2 A. Can I -- well let me -- let -- let me put that
- 3 in its context. During the course of the last couple
- 4 of days, I think I have on several occasions talked
- 5 to you about the system by which B.A.T. Industries
- 6 deals with its operating companies, and we've talked
- 7 about the way in which the delegated authority
- 8 confers considerable autonomy on the various
- 9 operations -- on the various operating companies
- 10 which are owned by B.A.T. Industries.
- 11 And as part of that delegated authority system,
- 12 the operating companies of B.A.T. Industries are
- 13 essentially entitled to manage -- not only entitled,
- 14 I think are expected to manage their -- their own
- 15 affairs subject to certain major matters of
- 16 importance, which would be of importance to any owner
- 17 of the company. And one of the matters which is
- 18 reserved for a reference so that where the operating
- 19 company forms a -- takes a position on something, one
- 20 of the matters which it is required to refer to its
- 21 parent company is the question of the remuneration of
- 22 its senior executive officers, essentially the
- 23 members of its board and possibly some of the other
- 24 senior executives, but principally the members of its
- 25 board.

- 1 Now part of the remuneration package of the
- 2 members of the board of Brown & Williamson would be
- 3 benefits they would receive under the executive
- 4 incentive plan, which is essentially a bonus plan
- 5 arrangement, and because, as I say, that forms part
- 6 of their remuneration, it is a requirement or was a
- 7 requirement in -- it certainly was a requirement in
- 8 1992 and -- and subsequent to 1992 for the levels of
- 9 bonus payments being made to the directors, the board
- 10 of directors of Brown & Williamson, a major operating
- 11 company owned by B.A.T. Industries, to be referred to
- 12 the CPC and/or CEC for discussion.
- 13 Q. I previously asked whether B.A.T. approves the
- 14 executive incentive plan for Brown & Williamson, and
- 15 you gave me a very long answer. With that answer in
- 16 mind, you're saying that B.A.T. does approve the
- 17 executive incentive plan for Brown & Williamson;
- 18 right?
- 19 A. I think what I'm -- I -- I mean, the -- the plan
- 20 as such I think has been in existence for -- for --
- 21 for -- for a long time. The directors of B. -- of
- 22 Brown & Williamson have been entitled to participate
- 23 in the executive incentive plan certainly I think for
- 24 as long as I have been at B.A.T. Industries and --
- 25 and probably much longer.

- 1 So what I'm saying to you is that payments made
- 2 to the directors of Brown & Williamson pursuant to
- 3 the executive incentive plan will be approved at
- 4 B.A.T. Industries.
- 5 Q. All right. B.A.T. Industries also establishes
- 6 long-term performance objectives for Brown &
- 7 Williamson, doesn't it, sir?
- 8 A. Does or did?
- 9 Q. B.A.T. Industries did approve long-term
- 10 performance -- I'm sorry, strike that.
- 11 B.A.T. Industries did establish long-term
- 12 performance objectives for Brown & Williamson, didn't
- 13 it?
- 14 A. I believe that to be the case because I believe
- 15 that Brown & Williamson has a long-term performance
- 16 plan which also provides benefits, some remunerative
- 17 benefits, for the directors of Brown & Williamson,
- 18 and I'm going to go further on this and -- and talk a
- 19 little bit more about these plans and the performance
- 20 and the payments made for performance under these
- 21 plans.
- 22 I think it's important to bear in mind that when
- 23 criteria and objectives and guidelines are discussed
- 24 and plans are produced on the basis of guidelines and
- 25 remuneration is being assessed against performance,

- 1 against guidelines, one has to remember that there is
- 2 a considerable degree of flexibility in these
- 3 matters. It would not be entirely reasonable for a
- 4 holding company to hold, for example, one of its
- 5 operating companies to the strict criteria which the
- 6 operating company and the holding company between
- 7 themselves -- may have agreed between themselves for
- 8 determining the basis upon which remuneration is
- 9 paid, and one can think of a number of external
- 10 circumstances which without any warning may have
- 11 affected the performance of a particular operating
- 12 group and therefore have impacted upon the
- 13 remuneration which will ultimately be paid to the
- 14 directors of that operating group if some flexibility
- 15 wasn't built into the system.
- 16 Q. But again, you've given me a very long answer to
- 17 that question, and keeping that answer in mind, it is
- 18 correct, isn't it, that B.A.T. approved the long-term
- 19 performance objectives for -- strike that. Let me
- 20 rephrase it.
- 21 You've given me a very long answer to that
- 22 question. Isn't it correct that B.A.T. Industries
- 23 approved the long-term performance objectives for
- 24 Brown & Williamson?
- 25 A. I -- I -- I believe that's -- that that's so,

- 1 yes. I -- I can't remember a specific instance, but
- 2 I -- I believe that that may well be so.
- 3 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 651 was marked
- 4 for identification.)
- 5 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 6 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 7 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 651, this is a memo that begins
- 8 with Bates number 191001064; correct?
- 9 A. Yes, that's the case.
- 10 Q. All right. And the first page is a letter from
- 11 M. E. Chamberlayne to Tom Sandefur at Brown &
- 12 Williamson; correct?
- 13 A. Yes, it's a letter from Mark Chamberlayne to
- 14 Mr. Sandefur, the chairman of Brown & Williamson,
- 15 dated 14th March 1994.
- 16 Q. And that letter -- strike that.
- 17 What position did Mark Chamberlayne have at the
- 18 time this letter was written?
- 19 A. I believe in March 1994 Mr. Chamberlayne was the
- 20 head of group personnel services or something
- 21 similar -- very similar to that.
- 22 Q. For B.A.T. Industries?
- 23 A. For B.A.T. Industries, yes.
- 24 Q. All right. This document says in the cover
- 25 letter that it attaches revisions to the EIP plan;

- 1 correct?
- 2 A. "As" -- "As promised, I have had the revisions
- 3 to the EIP Plan put into the attached amended
- 4 version. As I understand it, this now is the agreed
- 5 version of the 1994 Incentive Criteria." Yes, that's
- 6 what it says.
- 7 Q. And if you look at the next page, you see the
- 8 EIP performance ranges that he is referring to;
- 9 correct?
- 10 A. The next page, yes, is headed "BROWN &
- 11 WILLIAMSON, 1994 EIP PERFORMANCE RANGES, " yes.
- 12 Q. All right. And if we look at the next page that
- 13 ends with Bates number 066, that is the beginning of
- 14 the long-term performance objectives for Brown &
- 15 Williamson that were approved by B.A.T. Industries;
- 16 correct?
- 17 A. I'm sorry. If you're going to ask me questions
- 18 on the document, which I don't recall having seen, I
- 19 would like to have the opportunity to read it before
- 20 I answer blind on this. I -- I really haven't -- I
- 21 don't recall having seen this document, so I would
- 22 like, please, just to be able to --
- 23 Q. That's fine.
- 24 A. -- to read it.
- MS. WIVELL: And in the meantime, I need to

- 1 take a rest room break, so excuse me.
- THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 3 (Recess taken.)
- 4 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 652 was marked
- for identification.)
- 6 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 7 Q. Sir, directing your attention at the page that
- 8 ends with Bates number 066.
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. All right. That is the beginning of the
- 11 long-term performance objectives for Brown &
- 12 Williamson which were approved by B.A.T. Industries;
- 13 correct?
- 14 A. I believe that -- well I can't dispute that. I
- 15 can't confirm it. It would seem reasonable to
- 16 suggest that since it is attached to a letter, is
- 17 referred to in a -- well actually I'm not sure now,
- 18 now I say that, because when I look back at the
- 19 letter, the letter refers to revisions to the EIP
- 20 plan put into the attached amended version, and what
- 21 is in fact attached here is Brown & Williamson 1994
- 22 EIP performance ranges and -- and then there is also
- 23 attached Brown & Williamson long-term performance
- 24 object -- objectives ALTP. So I'm -- I'm not
- 25 entirely sure that document Bates numbered 191001066,

- 1 which is the page you've referred to, is actually
- 2 part of the same package which is referred to in the
- 3 covering letter because the covering letter is quite
- 4 clear in talking about a Brown & Williamson 1994 EIP
- 5 plan and the reference in the paragraph to the
- 6 attachment seems only to make reference to the EIP
- 7 plan.
- 8 So I'm not really in a position to confirm or
- 9 deny what you say, but while we're on the subject --
- 10 and I mentioned the EIP plan because it's referred to
- 11 here and it's attached to the letter -- you'll recall
- 12 in the previous answer I talked about the flexibility
- 13 which is inherent in the whole process of
- 14 establishing the bonus performance which are payable
- 15 to directors of the operating companies, and I think
- 16 $\,$ I mentioned to you that these things are not hard and
- 17 fast. There is a degree of flexibility built into
- 18 these matters.
- 19 And if I could just direct your attention, if I
- 20 may respectfully do so, to the document which bears
- 21 the Bates number 191001065, which is the second page
- 22 of the Exhibit 651, if you look at the top line or --
- 23 well you'll see there's a heading "BROWN &
- 24 WILLIAMSON, 1994 EIP PERFORMANCE RANGES, "brackets,
- 25 "(Dollars in Millions, "comma, "U.K. Basis), "close

- 1 brackets. Then you'll see there are, I think,
- 2 five -- six column headings. You will see that under
- 3 the column heading -- the fourth column heading
- 4 along, which starts with the word "COMM," which I
- 5 take to be "commendable," you will see that the
- 6 figure given for trading profit is 446.1, which I
- 7 think is a -- a dollar figure. You will see there's
- 8 an asterisk by it and it says at the bottom of the
- 9 page where the asterisk is marked that "The" -- and I
- 10 quote, "The Trading Profit requirements are on the
- 11 basis of no price increases or decreases as a result
- 12 of another 'trade war' during the year. If there are
- 13 any increases obtained then "the "targets will be
- 14 adjusted."
- 15 And that, as I say, demonstrates the degree of
- 16 flexibility. The -- the trade war referred to there
- 17 is, I believe, a reference back to the circumstances
- 18 which arose in 1993, in April 1993, on a day which
- 19 has become well known as Marlboro Friday, which was
- 20 when Philip Morris, the owner of -- I'm not sure
- 21 whether it's Philip Morris Inc. or Philip Morris
- 22 U.S., but nevertheless Philip Morris reduced the
- 23 price of its premium-brand cigarette, Marlboro,
- 24 precipitating a major price war amongst the U.S.
- 25 tobacco manufacturers, and Brown & Williamson had a

- 1 substantial share of the value-for-money segment,
- 2 which is the lower end of the market, and the
- 3 value-for-money segment had gained a very substantial
- 4 foothold. And in order to reassert the dominant
- 5 market share position of Marlboro, Philip Morris
- 6 decided to heavily discount their brand with the
- 7 result that it led to substantial discounting by
- 8 Brown & Williamson of its value-for-money brands,
- 9 causing a substantial reduction in its overall
- 10 trading profit.
- 11 And this document is simply a reflection of
- 12 those sorts of circumstances and -- and is saying
- 13 that where those circumstances occur, then the
- 14 objectives which we, B.A.T. Industries, have agreed
- 15 with you, Brown & Williamson, against which we will
- 16 judge your bonus payments will obviously be adjusted
- 17 in the event of unforeseen circumstances.
- 18 Q. Move to strike that speech.
- 19 Sir, would you please turn to the page that ends
- 20 with Bates number 070. There is a memo from Tom
- 21 Sandefur to the vice president and directors;
- 22 correct?
- 23 A. There is a memorandum, yes, yes.
- 24 Q. And it starts "The official 1994 Performance
- 25 Criteria and Long-Term Objectives have now been

- 1 approved by BAT"; correct?
- 2 A. That's what the document states.
- 3 Q. And the "BAT" refers to B.A.T. Industries,
- 4 doesn't it, sir?
- 5 A. I simply don't know. I can't deny or confirm.
- 6 Q. And it says "A copy of the Long-Term Objectives
- 7 is attached"; right?
- 8 A. It says "A copy of the Long-Term Objectives is
- 9 attached, "yes.
- 10 Q. And if you turn to page 071, you see a -- a copy
- 11 of the long-term performance objectives that were
- 12 approved by B.A.T. Industries; isn't that true, sir?
- 13 A. Sorry, can you repeat the question, please.
- 14 Q. Yes. And if you turn to page 071, you see a
- 15 copy of the long-term performance objectives that
- 16 were approved by B.A.T. Industries for Brown &
- 17 Williamson; correct?
- 18 A. At page 071 I see a document headed "BROWN &
- 19 WILLIAMSON, LONG-TERM PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES." I
- 20 don't immediately see any reference in that document
- 21 to these long-term performance objectives having been
- 22 approved by B.A.T. Industries.
- 23 Q. Sir, that is the same document that begins at
- 24 page 066, which is attached as the third page to
- 25 Mr. Herter's letter; correct?

- 1 MS. McGARRY: I -- I'm just going to object
- 2 here. The witness had expressed a desire to read the
- 3 entire document before he was questioned on it.
- 4 During a break I think he was led to believe there
- 5 was going to be a question that he could answer
- 6 without reading it, and therefore he didn't read it,
- 7 but now we've gone much further, and before he
- 8 answers questions about this Sandefur memorandum, I
- 9 think the witness should be afforded the time he
- 10 needs to read it.
- 11 MS. WIVELL: Then I withdraw the question.
- 12 Sir, could you hand the witness -- no.
- 13 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 14 Q. You attended a board meeting of B.A.T.
- 15 Industries' board at which Mr. Sandefur's testimony
- 16 before the U.S. Senate subcommittee headed by
- 17 Congressman Waxman was addressed; correct?
- 18 A. I believe I have attended a board meeting and
- 19 it's certainly conceivable that Mr. Sandefur's
- 20 testimony before Congressman Waxman was discussed.
- 21 Yes, it's certainly conceivable. I can't confirm
- 22 absolutely, but I wouldn't be surprised if that were
- 23 the case.
- 24 Q. Was the board concerned that Mr. Sandefur denied
- 25 cigarettes were addictive when he testified before

- 1 the U.S. Senate subcommittee?
- 2 MS. McGARRY: Objection, assumes facts not
- 3 in evidence.
- 4 A. Sorry, can you repeat the question for me.
- 5 Q. Yes. Was the board concerned that Mr. Sandefur
- 6 denied cigarettes were addictive when he testified
- 7 before the U.S. Senate subcommittee?
- 8 MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 9 A. Well I can't -- you know, I -- I think I
- 10 indicated earlier that I -- you know, it's
- 11 conceivable that Mr. Sandefur's testimony was
- 12 discussed at a meeting of the board at which I was
- 13 present, but I -- I don't have a particular
- 14 recollection now as to what was discussed about
- 15 Mr. Sandefur's testimony, so I would be speculating
- 16 if I actually said what the board thought, and that's
- 17 my answer.
- MS. WIVELL: Would you hand the witness
- 19 Exhibit 650, please -- or 652, is it?
- THE REPORTER: Yes.
- MS. McGARRY: Sorry, could we hear from the
- 22 reporters what time is left?
- 23 (Indication by video technician as to
- the amount of deposition elapsed time.)
- MS. McGARRY: Three minutes. Thank you.

- 1 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 2 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 3 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 652, this is a document you wrote
- 4 entitled "B.A.T. INDUSTRIES PLC, Reporting Minutes";
- 5 correct?
- 6 MS. McGARRY: Thank you.
- 7 A. Yes, I think that's a -- a correct -- yes,
- 8 correct categorization of the document. Yes, I did
- 9 write it.
- 10 Q. All right. And you wrote it in your position as
- 11 company secretary for B.A.T. Industries; right?
- 12 A. No, that's not actually correct. I wrote it in
- 13 my capacity as secretary of a -- essentially a
- 14 luncheon club which is held every Monday or almost
- 15 every Monday at B.A.T. Industries, and it is a -- a
- 16 luncheon which is held between the executive
- 17 directors of the company who happen to be present at
- 18 the time and the various heads of departments, the
- 19 purpose of which is to basically keep people in the
- 20 company, the senior managers within B.A.T.
- 21 Industries, up to date with major events or events of
- 22 interest about the company and about its subsidiaries
- 23 which they would like to be aware of or which they
- 24 may in fact have acquired information about through
- 25 other sources.

- 1 Q. And there was a discussion at this meeting about
- 2 Mr. Sandefur's evidence to the congressional
- 3 subcommittee headed by Congressman Waxman; right?
- 4 A. Yes, minute four indicates that that was -- that
- 5 that was the case, yes.
- 6 Q. And at this meeting was there concern expressed
- 7 that Mr. Sandefur had lied to the U.S. Senate?
- 8 MS. McGARRY: Objection, assumes facts not
- 9 in evidence.
- 10 A. I don't recall any concern having been
- 11 expressed, but then I don't recall the nature of the
- 12 discussion which took place. This discussion which
- 13 is recorded here at 27th of June 1994 occurred over
- 14 three years ago. I can't possibly remember what was
- 15 said in the -- in the conversation. The minute I
- 16 think speaks for itself. It says "There was a
- 17 discussion on Mr Sandefur's evidence to the
- 18 Congressional Sub-Committee headed by Congressman
- 19 Waxman I can't go further than that.
- 20 Q. Well you understand, sir, that Mr. Sandefur
- 21 testified that cigarette smoking was not addictive?
- 22 MS. McGARRY: Objection. Can you tell me
- 23 what Mr. Sandefur's testimony as a B&W officer before
- 24 the Waxman Committee in the United States has to do
- 25 with jurisdiction by the Minnesota court over a U.K.

- 1 company that he didn't work for? This is irrelevant
- 2 to jurisdiction. It's beyond the scope of the
- 3 notice.
- 4 MS. WIVELL: Counsel, I object to your
- 5 violation of the court's order, and you're wasting
- 6 time when you know we're under five minutes.
- 7 A. Can you repeat the question for me.
- 8 Q. Yes, sir.
- 9 Did you understand that Mr. Sandefur testified
- 10 that cigarette smoking was not addictive?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, assumes facts not
- 12 in evidence.
- 13 A. I -- I recall that Mr. Sandefur gave evidence to
- 14 the congressional committee headed by Mr. Waxman. I
- 15 cannot recall whether Mr. Sandefur's testimony was to
- 16 the effect that -- sorry, I've -- I've lost the
- 17 question in the -- can you just read -- read back the
- 18 question to me. I'm sorry, I'm --
- 19 Q. Well let me rephrase the question, sir.
- 20 Was there concern expressed at this meeting
- 21 concerning Mr. Sandefur's testimony to the Senate
- 22 committee that cigarette smoking was not addictive?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, asked and
- 24 answered.
- 25 A. I think I've already said that I can't

- 1 recollect, you know, what the discussion precisely
- 2 was about. The minute must speak for itself. "There
- 3 was a discussion on Mr Sandefur's evidence to the
- 4 Congressional Sub-Committee headed by Congressman
- 5 Waxman " This was -- I've already said this was
- 6 over three years ago. I can't be expected to
- 7 remember every single fact, every single discussion,
- 8 every single matter to which I have been privy in the
- 9 course of my carrying out my duties at B.A.T.
- 10 Industries. This is just too long in the past for me
- 11 to be able to tell you, you know, exactly what was
- 12 discussed at that meeting.
- 13 Q. So is it your testimony --
- MS. McGARRY: Excuse me, I think we're out
- 15 of time.
- MS. WIVELL: I have one question.
- 17 Q. Is it your testimony as you sit here today that
- 18 you don't remember anything that was said during the
- 19 meeting that's referred to here in note four on
- 20 Exhibit 652?
- 21 MS. McGARRY: Just answer that question
- 22 "yes" or "no." We're out of time. It's irrelevant
- 23 to jurisdiction in any event.
- 24 A. Sorry, can you -- you'll have to repeat the
- 25 question. Sorry.

- 1 Q. All right.
- 2 MS. McGARRY: "Is it your testimony" --
- 3 MS. WIVELL: I'll read it, Counsel.
- 4 MS. McGARRY: Okay.
- 5 MS. WIVELL: Thank you.
- 6 Q. Is it your testimony as you sit here today that
- 7 you don't remember anything that was said during the
- 8 meeting that's referred to here in note four on
- 9 Exhibit 652?
- 10 MS. McGARRY: I assume you mean on the
- 11 subject of four, not in the meeting that's referred
- 12 to in note four. Right?
- 13 A. I --
- MS. McGARRY: I object. The question is
- 15 vague and ambiguous.
- 16 A. I do not remember anything about what was said
- 17 in the meeting which is recorded here in these
- 18 minutes beyond what is recorded here.
- MS. WIVELL: I have nothing further at this
- 20 time.
- MS. McGARRY: Thank you.
- THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 23 (Discussion off the record.)
- 24 (Defendants' Exhibit 2908 was marked
- for identification.)

1 DIRECT EXAMINATION

- 2 BY MS. McGARRY:
- 3 Q. Mr. Wilson, do you recall Ms. Wivell asking you
- 4 questions about B.A.T. Industries' joint ventures in
- 5 biotechnology?
- 6 A. Yes, I do.
- 7 Q. And you recall asking -- being asked questions
- 8 about the joint venture with NPI?
- 9 A. Yes, I do.
- 10 Q. And you recall answering a question as to where
- 11 NPI conducted its research?
- 12 A. Yes, I do.
- 13 Q. Do you recall what your answer to that question
- 14 was?
- 15 A. I don't recall precisely, save that I mentioned
- 16 that I believe research had been conducted in South
- 17 America, and I think I said that some analysis had
- 18 been carried out in Salt Lake City.
- 19 Q. Well, sir, was any biotechnology research
- 20 conducted in Salt Lake City by this joint venture, to
- 21 your knowledge?
- 22 A. Not to my knowledge, no.
- 23 Q. Do you have any understanding of the nature of
- 24 the analysis that was conducted in Salt Lake City?
- 25 A. Yes, I do.

- 1 Q. What was the nature of that analysis?
- 2 A. The plants which were the subject of the
- 3 biotechnology research in South America were --
- 4 before that research were sent to -- before that
- 5 research was conducted were sent to Salt Lake City
- 6 for testing for biological purity.
- 7 Q. And after the plants were tested for biological
- 8 purity, where, if anywhere, did they go for
- 9 research?
- 10 A. I believe they were sent back to the joint
- 11 venture in South America for research.
- MS. McGARRY: I have no further questions
- 13 of the witness.
- MS. WIVELL: Let me have a minute. Can we
- 15 go off the record.
- 16 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 17 (Discussion off the record.)
- 18 ADVERSE EXAMINATION
- 19 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 20 Q. Did B.A.T. Industries pay the Salt Lake City
- 21 research firm to do the testing for biological purity
- 22 that you just spoke about?
- 23 A. I do not know the answer to that question. I --
- 24 I do not know.
- 25 Q. It would be a reasonable expectation that they

- 1 would, wouldn't it, sir?
- 2 A. It would not --
- 3 MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 4 A. It would not be a reasonable expectation that
- 5 they would.
- 6 Q. Why is that?
- 7 A. Because I previously testified that the research
- 8 in question was done by the joint venture in -- with
- 9 the South American -- in South America with a company
- 10 in South America, not B.A. -- not B.A.T. Industries.
- 11 So well I can't understand why B.A.T. Industries
- 12 should be paying for the biological testing, but as
- 13 I've said to you, I have no knowledge. I can't
- 14 confirm or deny. I simply don't know.
- 15 Q. Well, sir, isn't it a fact that Alan Heard
- 16 worked on that biotechnology project involving D --
- 17 involving NIP --
- MS. McGARRY: NPI. I --
- 19 MS. WIVELL: Strike that.
- 20 MS. McGARRY: -- object. It's beyond the
- 21 scope of the direct.
- 22 Q. And, sir, isn't it a fact that Alan Heard worked
- 23 on that biotechnology project involving NI -- NPI on
- 24 behalf of B.A.T. Industries?
- MS. McGARRY: I object. It's beyond the

- 1 scope of the direct. I'll permit the witness to
- 2 answer this question.
- 3 A. I'm sorry, could you read the question back to
- 4 me, please.
- 5 Q. Yes. Isn't it a fact that Alan Heard worked on
- 6 that biotechnology project involving NPI on behalf of
- 7 B.A.T. Industries?
- 8 MS. McGARRY: Same objection.
- 9 A. I'm not sure what you mean by "worked on" and
- 10 I'm not sure what you mean by "project." I've
- 11 testified about B.A.T. Industries' interests in a
- 12 joint venture, but I'm not sure what you mean by
- 13 those terms that I referred to.
- MS. McGARRY: Does this document have to do
- 15 with the testing of plants done in Salt Lake City?
- 16 The only cross-examination I did was to clarify the
- 17 earlier testimony on that very specific point. I
- 18 don't think the court order allows you to use that to
- 19 go way beyond the scope of my questions and get
- 20 another two hours on your deposition. You ran
- 21 through your ten.
- 22 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 653 was marked
- for identification.)
- 24 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 25 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as

- 1 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 653, this is a document entitled
- 2 "Biotechnology Project, A.L. Heard," that begins
- 3 with Bates number 109873283; correct?
- 4 A. Correct.
- 5 Q. Sir, you've seen this document before, haven't
- 6 you?
- 7 A. I believe I have seen this document before,
- 8 yes.
- 9 Q. Would you turn to the page that ends with Bates
- 10 number 285.
- MS. McGARRY: Was this a document
- 12 predesignated for the deposition?
- MS. WIVELL: It most certainly was,
- 14 Counsel.
- MS. McGARRY: My response to my other
- 16 question, you didn't answer that, but as far as I can
- 17 tell, there is nothing in this document that relates
- 18 to Salt Lake City or the testing of biological purity
- 19 of plants.
- 20 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 21 Q. Do you have page 285, sir?
- 22 A. I do, yes.
- 23 Q. And there do you see the reference to "At
- 24 present BAT Industries is evaluating two issues"?
- 25 Right?

- 1 A. I do see that, yes.
- 2 Q. And it --
- 3 The first involves "the potential for plant
- 4 biotechnology in Europe a study conducted jointly
- 5 with NPI"; correct?
- 6 A. I'm sorry, I'm not going to answer questions on
- 7 this document until I can read the document. Please
- 8 may I read the document?
- 9 Q. Certainly.
- 10 A. Thank you.
- 11 (Witness reviews Plaintiffs' Exhibit 653.)
- 12 Q. You've now read the document?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Sir, the first point --
- The first issue being evaluated that's referred
- 16 to in the middle of the page that ends with Bates
- 17 number 285 is the potential for plant technology in
- 18 Europe; right?
- 19 A. "At present BAT Industries is evaluating two
- 20 issues:
- "i) the potential for plant biotechnology in
- 22 Europe"
- 23 Q. And it goes on to say "a study conducted jointly
- 24 with NPI"; correct?
- 25 A. It goes on to say "a study conducted jointly

- 1 with NPI."
- 2 Q. And in fact, sir, it was B.A.T. Industries that
- 3 was, as this document says, conducting a study
- 4 jointly on plant technology with NPI; isn't that
- 5 true?
- 6 MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 7 A. I'm sorry, can you read the question back to me,
- 8 please.
- 9 Q. Yes. And in fact, sir, it was B.A.T. Industries
- 10 that was, as the document states, conducting a study
- 11 jointly on plant technology with NPI; isn't that
- 12 true?
- 13 A. No, that's not true. That's not what the
- 14 document says. That's a mischaracterization. What
- 15 the document says is "the potential for plant
- 16 biotechnology in Europe." It does not talk about a
- 17 survey on plant biotechnology in Europe. It talks
- 18 about the potential for plant biotechnology in Europe
- 19 and then goes on to state -- to say "a study
- 20 conducted jointly with NPI." That's quite different,
- 21 I think, from the point you put to me with respect.
- 22 Q. And then it talks about getting the outcome of
- 23 the study, doesn't it, sir?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection. The document
- 25 speaks for itself. This is beyond the scope of the

- 1 direct.
- 2 A. The document refers -- I'm -- I'm going to read
- 3 from the document. The document says "The outcome
- 4 from this study, expected in two months, will tell us
- 5 whether we wish to enter Europe and whether NPI will
- 6 be available as technology partner." That's what the
- 7 document says, the document which was written by
- 8 A. L. Heard on the 12th -- well it's a -- a document
- 9 by A. L. Heard talking about a visit which he
- 10 conducted to B.A.T. Hamburg, which I think is in fact
- 11 the German company B.A.T Cigarettenfabriken, and
- 12 Mr. Heard I think was in the employ of BATCO.
- 13 Q. Well, sir, let me ask you this: Is this a
- 14 different study with NPI than the study that we
- 15 talked about during your direct examination -- or
- 16 your cross-examination?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection.
- 18 A. I don't know that we talked about a study in my
- 19 examination. I think we talked about a joint venture
- 20 in South America between a B.A.T. company and NPI. I
- 21 think that's different from a study.
- 22 Q. Well let me ask you this: Did B.A.T. Industries
- 23 conduct a study with NPI on the issue of plant
- 24 biotechnology?
- MS. McGARRY: Objection, asked and

- 1 answered, beyond the scope of the direct
- 2 examination.
- 3 A. The document says what the document says. It
- 4 does not say a study conducted by B.A.T. Industries
- 5 jointly with NPI; it may have been a study conducted
- 6 by B.A.T. Industries jointly with NPI.
- 7 What the document actually talks about, says
- 8 itself, "At present BAT Industries is evaluating two
- 9 issues." One of the issues which B.A.T. Industries
- 10 is reported in Mr. Heard's document as evaluating is
- 11 "the potential for plant biotechnology in Europe a
- 12 study conducted jointly with NPI." For all I know,
- 13 that study may have been conducted by BATCO with
- 14 NPI. There is no reason to suggest otherwise, and
- 15 that -- that's essentially what the document talks
- 16 about.
- 17 And if I may go further, at the bottom or
- 18 towards the bottom of the page there is a paragraph
- 19 which begins "Unfortunately the activity in Hamburg
- 20 is currently too small to constitute a viable
- 21 technology base for a commercial operation of
- 22 interest to BAT Industries " And you will recall
- 23 that -- from previous testimony I gave that I
- 24 mentioned that Sir Patrick Sheehy had an interest in
- 25 the subject of biotechnology in the mid-1980s and was

- 1 interested, I believe, in determining whether
- 2 biotechnology in itself was a new area of business in
- 3 which the B.A. -- in which B.A.T. Industries could
- 4 invest; in other words, whether there was a new set
- 5 of operating -- a new operating company, a new type
- 6 of operation in which B.A.T. Industries could invest
- 7 its money to grow the business for the value --
- 8 for -- value for its public stockholders. I think
- 9 that's what I said earlier, and this seems to me to
- 10 bear that out.
- 11 Q. Sir --
- MS. McGARRY: Ms. Wivell, I'm going to ask
- 13 whether you have any questions for this witness
- 14 concerning the work that was done in Salt Lake City,
- 15 in which the witness can stay up until 5:30 to answer
- 16 such questions. If not, you're going well beyond the
- 17 scope of the cross -- of the direct examination, and
- 18 we will not stay any further.
- MS. WIVELL: Well I disagree, Counsel. He
- 20 opened the door by answering -- and I can find it if
- 21 we'd like to take the time, but that B.A.T.
- 22 Industries was not involved directly with NPI. This
- 23 document directly contradicts that testimony, and
- 24 that's what I am trying to find out right now.
- 25 BY MS. WIVELL:

- 1 Q. Sir --
- MS. McGARRY: That's not what the witness's
- 3 testimony is doing. You completely mischaracterize
- 4 it.
- 5 THE WITNESS: I would like to take a
- 6 break. I would like to get some more water, please.
- 7 May I?
- 8 MS. McGARRY: Sure.
- 9 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
- 10 (Recess taken.)
- 11 BY MS. WIVELL:
- 12 Q. Sir, you previously testified that the research
- 13 in question done by the joint venture was not done by
- 14 B.A.T. Industries. Sir, isn't it a fact that B.A.T.
- 15 Industries did conduct this study that's referred to
- 16 here jointly with NPI?
- 17 MS. McGARRY: Objection, asked and
- 18 answered.
- 19 A. I -- I think I've already said before that
- 20 the -- that the -- I think the document speaks for
- 21 itself. What I have explained, I hope I had
- 22 explained, but obviously not clearly enough and I'll
- 23 try to help you again with this, is that the
- 24 document, which is a document written by Mr. Heard,
- 25 points to the fact or perhaps -- fact -- I don't know

- 1 whether it's a fact or not, but it says that B.A.T.
- 2 Industries is evaluating two issues. It says that
- 3 one of the issues that B.A.T. Industries is
- 4 evaluating is "the potential for plant biotechnology
- 5 in Europe a study conducted jointly with NPI."
- 6 And what I think I have said before is that that
- 7 suggests to me that B.A.T. Industries is evaluating a
- 8 study that has been conducted jointly with NPI, in
- 9 my -- in my view, almost certainly or very likely
- 10 with BATCO, and I -- I think, as I mentioned
- 11 before -- and I want to explain the rationale of this
- 12 because it's important to remember in the context of
- 13 a company such as B.A.T. Industries, which does not
- 14 manufacture and market cigarette products, that
- 15 B.A.T. Industries itself would not be conducting
- 16 research. It's most unlikely that B.A.T.
- 17 Industries -- Industries itself would be conducting a
- 18 study jointly with NPI on the subject of plant
- 19 biotechnology because I think we probably all
- 20 recognize that plant biotechnology is a scientific
- 21 matter and B.A.T. Industries, to my knowledge, has
- 22 never employed scientists on its staff and therefore
- 23 wouldn't be equipped to carry out such a study with
- 24 NPI. It would, as would seem logical, look to its
- 25 operating subsidiaries for advice and guidance on

- 1 matters related to issues such as plant biotechnology
- 2 to the extent that it needed that sort of advice,
- 3 presumably if it were in connection with the tobacco
- 4 plant.
- 5 So I -- I'm -- I'm not convinced, as I said
- 6 before, that this document means what you have
- 7 suggested it means, and I -- I don't think I can
- 8 answer it any more fairly than I have.
- 9 Q. Well, sir, if you take a look at the end of the
- 10 second complete paragraph of this document, you see
- 11 that Mr. Heard referred to NPI as, quote, "the
- 12 technology partner selected by BAT Industries as
- 13 joint venture partner for our potential Latin
- 14 American businesses"; isn't that true, sir?
- MS. McGARRY: Sir -- Martha, you're --
- 16 you're going beyond my direct and now you claim you
- 17 had to ask questions to follow up and clarify an
- 18 answer Mr. Wilson gave you, but now you're going
- 19 beyond that. I'm directing the witness not to
- 20 answer. If you have any questions about what was
- 21 done --
- MS. WIVELL: Excuse me. On what grounds
- 23 are you directing the witness not to answer?
- MS. McGARRY: Are you done interrupting
- 25 me? I'll finish. Are you done?

- 1 If you have questions about what was done in
- 2 Salt Lake City, the witness will answer. If you
- 3 don't have any questions coming out of what my direct
- 4 was about, the deposition is over.
- 5 MS. WIVELL: Then call the court.
- 6 MS. McGARRY: The deposition is over.
- 7 Apparently Ms. Wivell doesn't have any questions.
- 8 MS. WIVELL: No, I would like an answer to
- 9 my question, and then I will be done.
- 10 MS. McGARRY: Yeah, that's what you said
- 11 before.
- MS. WIVELL: So, Counsel, you're
- 13 unilaterally terminating this deposition?
- MS. McGARRY: I directed the witness not to
- 15 answer your last question, which you --
- MS. WIVELL: So you --
- 17 MS. McGARRY: -- said was your only
- 18 question.
- MS. WIVELL: So you've taken off your
- 20 mike. You're getting -- you're leaving?
- MS. McGARRY: Yeah.
- MS. WIVELL: Your son is here, so you're
- 23 done with the deposition; is that right?
- MS. McGARRY: That's not the reason I gave
- 25 you, Martha.

1	MS. WIVELL: I would just like the record
2	to reflect counsel is leaving the room.
3	MS. McGARRY: Counsel is directing the
4	witness to leave the room. We're done.
5	BY MS. WIVELL:
6	Q. Well I would like the record to reflect then
7	that the document states, quote
8	MS. McGARRY: You can leave. She's just
9	reading.
10	Q " NPI, the technology partner selected by
11	BAT Industries as joint venture partner for our
12	potential Latin American businesses, doesn't it,
13	sir?
14	MS. McGARRY: We're leaving. The
15	deposition is over.
16	MS. WIVELL: Well I object to this process
17	and I'm sorry that this deposition interferes with
18	your personal and private life, Counsel, so that you
19	feel you need to leave.
20	THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
21	(Deposition recessed at 5:23 o'clock
22	p.m.)
23	
24	

25

1	CERTIFICATE
2	I, William C. LaBorde, hereby certify that
3	I am qualified as a verbatim shorthand reporter; that
4	I took in stenographic shorthand the testimony of
5	DAVID WILSON at the time and place aforesaid; and
6	that the foregoing transcript consisting of pages 255
7	through 494, Volume II, is a true and correct, full
8	and complete transcription of said shorthand notes,
9	to the best of my ability.
10	Dated at Las Vegas, Nevada, this 18th day
11	of August 1997.
12	
13	
14	
15	WILLIAM C. LaBORDE
16	Registered Professional Reporter
17	Notary Public
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE
2	I, DAVID WILSON, the deponent, hereby
3	certify that I have read the foregoing transcript
4	consisting of pages 255 through 494, Volume II, and
5	that said transcript is a true and correct, full and
6	complete transcription of my deposition, except per
7	the attached corrections, if any.
8	
9	(Please check one.)
10	
11	Yes, changes were made per the attached
12	(no.) pages.
13	
14	No changes were made.
15	
16	
17	DAVID WILSON
18	Deponent
19	
20	Sworn and subscribed to before me this day
21	of 199
22	
23	
24	Notary Public
25	My commission expires: (WCL)
	STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES

P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953